A COMPARISON OF FLORIDA TEACHER EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND COMPENSATION PATTERNS OCCURRING BEFORE AND AFTER THE ENACTMENT OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM

By

Martha Jean Belcher

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1979

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons have assisted the author in giving the encouragement that was necessary for completion of the requirements for various stages of her professional and academic career. Special acknowledgment is given for the assistance and guidance of Dr. Kern Alexander as doctoral committee chairman. Additionally, thanks are given to Dr. Ralph Kimbrough and Dr. Arthur Lewis, members of her committee who offered suggestions and support.

Staff members in the Office of Personnel, Dade County Public Schools, were the kinds of friends and professional resources who enabled the author to gather necessary data to complete the document that is to follow. Respondents to information requests were key to the success of the author in her endeavor. Persons at the State Department of Education were most helpful in their responses to information requests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES v

ABSTRACT vi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

- Statement of the Problem 2
- Procedures 2
- Limitations 5
- Justification of the Study 6
- Assumptions 6
- Definitions 7

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 9

- Teacher Hiring Practices in the United States 9
- Types of Salary Schedule Plans 21
- The Minimum Foundation Program Salary Allocation 26
- The Florida Education Finance Program 31

III. PRESENTATION OF DATA: TEACHER EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND COMPENSATION PATTERNS BEFORE THE 1973 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM 39

- Existing Documents 39
- Salary Schedules 41
- Information Obtained from Survey Responses 43

IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA: TEACHER EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND COMPENSATION PATTERNS AFTER THE 1973 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM 50

Page

Chapter

Existing Documents 50
Salary Schedules 51
Information Obtained from Survey Responses 51

V. ANALYSIS OF DATA GATHERED FROM COMBINED SOURCES 62

Salary Schedule Comparisons 62
Combined Survey Responses 65

VI. FLORIDA SCHOOL DISTRICT FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS 67

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 70

Experience Data 74
Training Data 74
Miscellaneous Data 75
Salary Schedule Data 76
Conclusions 77
Implications 78
Recommendations 80

REFERENCES 83

APPENDIX

A FLORIDA DISTRICT PROFILE GROUPINGS 88

B COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 1951-52 90

C COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 1972-73 97

D SURVEY FORM 105

E COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 1977-78 109

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 115

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table

1. BRIEF SUMMARY OF 1951-52 FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 42
2. BRIEF SUMMARY OF 1972-73 FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 44
3. RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY--PRE-1973 46
4. RESULTS OF FLORIDA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION LOCALS SURVEY--PRE-1973 48
5. TEACHER EXPERIENCE LEVELS FOR FLORIDA DISTRICTS--1973-74 52
6. BRIEF SUMMARY OF 1977-78 FLORIDA DISTRICT SALARY INFORMATION 54
7. RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY--POST-1973 56
8. RESULTS OF FLORIDA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SURVEY--POST-1973 60
9. SALARY SCHEDULE COMPARISON 63

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

A COMPARISON OF FLORIDA TEACHER EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND COMPENSATION PATTERNS OCCURRING BEFORE AND AFTER THE ENACTMENT OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM

By

Martha Jean Belcher

June 1979

Chairman: Dr. S. Kern Alexander
Major Department: Educational Administration

The attitude of the Florida Legislature toward recruiting, hiring, paying, and supervising public school teachers has been codified in at least two very significant, but different, legislative programs. The first of these programs, the Minimum Foundation Program (MFP), was enacted in 1947. It utilized the instructional unit as the basis for educational funding. This funding program included a salary portion that was designed to encourage school districts to hire teachers with more experience and training, under the assumption that more experience and training leads to better teaching. A district was allocated funds, in part, determined by the level of experience and/or training possessed by its teachers. In 1973, the Florida Legislature implemented a new program entitled the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP). In this program the instructional unit was replaced by the full-time equivalent student method of funding. Under its provisions, state funds were no longer allocated to give additional funds to districts that hired teachers with more experience or training.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there have been any identifiable or significant changes in teacher employment practices in the state of Florida as they relate to experience, training, and compensation patterns since the enactment of the Florida Education Finance Program. To this end, a survey instrument was developed and distributed to the 67 Florida school districts and the 42 Florida Education Association United Locals. A cross-section of eight Florida districts was then selected for follow-up interviews in which each district's representative was asked to elaborate on the procedures and practices utilized or anticipated in his/her district as they relate to employment practices of teachers. Actual district salary schedules or salary compilations from 1952 to 1977-78 were analyzed for all districts. As a result of the examination of the Florida district survey responses (100% return), Florida Education Association United Local survey responses (67% return), follow-up interviews, and salary analysis, it was found that there had been changes in teacher employment related to experience, training, and compensation patterns in Florida since 1973, the year that the Florida Education Finance Program was implemented. Summarized briefly, these Florida changes included:

1. The average level of teacher experience had decreased since 1973.
2. The average level of teacher training had increased since 1973.
3. While all but one district salary schedule continued to reward increased experience and training for teachers,

11% of Florida school districts reported knowledge of moves to no longer reward teacher experience; 15% to no longer reward training.

4. Restrictions had been placed in some districts on the training that was accepted for salary reward.
5. Only 22% of Florida districts reported an awareness of the hiring of minimally trained and/or experienced teachers because they were less expensive, while 57% of union representatives reported knowledge of such hirings.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The characteristics of persons employed and retained in the teaching profession in the United States and the procedures for teacher employment are what they are today partially due to forces and circumstances which began developing with the establishment of the first school on the New England Coast. Additionally, current national economic conditions, feelings, stereotypes, and consequent priorities provide the overall determination of whom and how one is hired and allowed to continue to teach in the public schools. Officially, however, the states through their constitutions and statutory provisions regulate and control public education--including teacher hiring requirements and retention practices. Each state legislature, in providing for a uniform system of free schools, has reflected national, state, and local beliefs in its school legislation.

Beliefs of the people of Florida toward recruiting, hiring, paying, and supervising teachers have been codified in two very significant, but different legislative programs. In 1947 the first of these programs, the Minimum Foundation Program (MFP), was enacted. This program utilized the instructional unit as the basis for educational funding. It included a salary allotment that was designed to encourage districts to hire teachers with more experience and training, under the assumption that more experience and training leads to better teaching.

In 1973 the Florida Legislature implemented another program, the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP). In this Act the instructional unit was replaced by the full-time equivalent student method of funding. Under this method, no longer were state funds allotted specifically for salaries.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to identify any significant trends in Florida teacher employment practices relative to teacher training, experience, and compensation patterns occurring since the enactment and implementation of the Florida Education Finance Program.

Procedures

The thrust of this study was to examine two specific funding procedures for education and their impact on teacher employment practices. Information was collected and examined to give an empirical basis for making inferences as to the effects of the most recent of these funding procedures, the Florida Education Finance Program, on teacher employment practices as they relate specifically to training and/or experience as reflected in salary schedules. Historical practices relating to teacher employment were briefly traced in this study to give the basis upon which the two educational procedures, the Minimum Foundation Program and the Florida Education Finance Program, were built. The specific time parameters of this study were from 1947 to 1973 under MFP and from 1973 through the 1977-78 school year under the FEFP.

The following procedures were utilized in this study to compare Florida teacher experience, training, and compensation patterns occurring before and after the enactment of the Florida Education Finance Program:

1. Existing documents concerning employment practices in the United States were reviewed.
2. Existing documents concerning employment practices of teachers in Florida as they relate to experience, training, and compensation patterns were reviewed. Specific interest areas included any documents that stated trends as reflected under:
    a. Minimum Foundation Program (1947-1973);
    b. Florida Education Finance Program (1973-1978).
3. A survey instrument was developed and distributed for the purpose of determining employment trends that could not be ascertained by examining existing documents. This instrument was distributed to:
    a. representatives of the 67 school districts in the state of Florida;
    b. representatives of 42 Florida Education Association United Locals.
4. Returns from these two survey sources were received and the information was compiled.
5. Eight districts were chosen for follow-up interviews. The districts chosen for these interviews were selected by use of the following criteria:

a. At least one school district was selected from each of five school district groupings developed by the State Department of Education as reported in Profiles of Florida School Districts, 1976-77 (p. 2) (see Appendix A). Groupings were derived by using a weighted index based upon a combination of five different variables: population size, average family income, percent urban, median education, and number of white collar workers. These factors had been shown to closely relate to many of the factors affecting education, and consequently yielded groups that are comparable along several such dimensions.

b. Districts were given strong consideration for selection when initial survey responses reflected movement away from practices and procedures established under MFP.

c. Attempts were made to include representation from different geographic locations in the state of Florida.

d. Availability of persons to respond to a personal interview during a period of time when many school districts were in the process of negotiation was noted.

e. Two districts were included in the follow-up that had not responded to the initial mailed survey instrument.

6. An analysis of all data gathered was made to determine if any significant trends had developed in the state of Florida as they related to teacher experience and/or training as reflected in compensation patterns since the enactment of the Florida Education Finance Program.

The results of the survey responses, interviews, and observations made of salary schedules were used by the author to help interpret, synthesize, and organize data in order to point to implications and interrelationships--not test hypotheses. The characteristics of Florida teachers as they relate to experience and/or training and the observations made of salary schedules before and after 1973 were used only to infer a crude change and effect relationship. There were many other economic and political conditions that had to be recognized and considered in determining the cause of any changes observed subsequent to the enactment of the Florida Education Finance Program.

Limitations

While many social and economic factors prevalent in Florida were also characteristic of the entire nation, the findings of this study conducted in Florida school districts could not be generalized to teacher employment practices in the entire United States or in other states.

Since a historical study was used to determine trends in teacher employment practices under MFP, only information that had been maintained by state or district levels was available for use. After the implementation of the FEFP in 1973, much information relative to teacher experience and training levels was no longer solicited from individual Florida districts by the State Department of Education. For purposes of this study, therefore, most of this information had to be requested of the local districts, with varying degrees of success. While all school districts did respond to the survey instrument that the author distributed, many districts did not respond with actual figures relating to teacher experience and training, but expressed approximations of experience and training levels.

Justification of the Study

The effects of the FEFP on teacher employment practices have been uncertain. Informally gathered information has reflected that many persons have been concerned that teacher experience and advanced training would be discontinued as salary determinants. Further, it was thought that in some districts which continued to reward experience and training, persons had been hired who possessed only minimal experience and/or training because they were less expensive. Morphet (1952) stressed that all such effects and implications of a state educational financing system need to be examined carefully.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in developing this study:

1. That the survey instrument and interviews fully measured the information and constructs needed.
2. That respondents who made approximations for answers were reasonably accurate in their responses.

Definitions

The following definitions were included to aid the reader in addressing specific terms used in this study:

1. Collective Bargaining Act of 1973--Act passed in Florida providing for collective bargaining for public employees. Teachers were included in its provisions.
2. Collective bargaining--A mutual obligation of an employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment.
3. Continuing contract--Tenure granted to instructional personnel in the State of Florida under the provisions of _Florida Statutes_, 231.351.
4. Florida Education Finance Program--Program used by the state of Florida to finance elementary and secondary education since 1973, abbreviated FEFP.
5. Full-time Equivalent Student--The method of determining the amount of educational funding allocated to districts under the Florida Education Finance Program. It consists of one student on the membership roll of one recognized school program for five school days or the equivalent for not less than 25 hours per week. Teacher salary costs are not considered in the full-time equivalent formula for funding.
6. Instructional Unit--The method used to determine the amount of educational funding allocated to districts under the Minimum Foundation Program. An instructional unit was a

classroom unit of 27 students. Teacher salary costs were included in this allocation formula.

7. Merit salary schedule--Salary schedule which rewards merit or teacher quality.
8. Minimum Foundation Program--The state of Florida program for financing elementary and secondary education from 1947-1973, abbreviated MFP.
9. Positional salary schedule--Schedule that gives additional remuneration depending upon a teacher's position in the school system: elementary, secondary, etc.
10. Preparational salary schedule--Schedule that gives additional remuneration depending upon a teacher's training.
11. Single salary schedule--Salary schedule which bases reward on the preparation of the teacher. This schedule type is also called the preparational schedule.
12. Step-type salary schedule--Schedule with rows that indicate years of successful teaching for which additional remuneration is given. In reality, the rows have come to mean years of experience, since when this type of schedule is combined with a preparational-type schedule, increments are infrequently withheld or speeded up as a result of a supervisor's recommendation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to acquaint the reader with the body of written information concerning teacher employment practices as they relate to this study, the following areas are included in the Review of Related Literature:

1. A brief history of teacher hiring and employment practices in the United States as they relate to experience and/or training and compensation patterns;
2. The development of the various types of salary schedule plans for teachers; and
3. The approach of the state of Florida to teacher employment practices as codified in two major legislative programs---the Minimum Foundation Program and the Florida Education Finance Program.

Teacher Hiring Practices in the United States

Patterns that presently determine who is hired to teach in the public schools in the United States and how they are hired were begun by the early pioneers of our nation. While it is true that one must be very cautious about making any sweeping generalizations about the required characteristics and qualifications of colonial teachers, some general observations might be made. The academic qualifications of these early teachers ranged from the bare ability to read and write to the possession of a college degree. Usually the younger the children to be taught, the lower were the requirements of the school master. In an especially unfavored area, the desire to "keep" school was enough to qualify a person to teach (Elsbree, 1939, p. 32). Other qualifications in colonial times included: (a) a positive disposition toward the present government, (b) adherence to the prevailing religious tenets (Conant, 1963, p. 9; Elsbree, 1939, p. 37; Stinnett, Drummond, & Garry, 1976, p. 85). No uniform policy concerning experience, age, marital status, or residence was evident. Of direct concern to this study, it is noted that preference was undoubtedly given to experienced colonial teachers when a community had a choice (Elsbree, 1939, p. 41).

The forms used to license school masters were not uniform throughout the colonies (Kinney, 1964, p. 36; Stinnett et al., 1976, p. 85). At no time did it appear that a supply of qualified school masters was so large as to require the introduction of methods to eliminate weak applicants (Elsbree, 1939, p. 50). Those applicants that had graduated from universities had their mastery of subject matter attested to by the fact that they had passed the examinations leading to the university degree. Secular authorities established two basic screening devices for teaching applicants--character witness and written and oral exams. Since many local boards were hard pressed to find any teacher, some tended to tailor the exam they used to fit whatever candidate became available. Personal favoritism and simple graft often entered into the teacher selection process (Conant, 1963, p. 9). Local residents were frequently employed in elementary schools (Elsbree, 1939, p. 41). There is considerable evidence that every colony had some ignorant and poorly educated teacher. Many communities, however, did insist on high qualifications for their teachers (Elsbree, 1939, p. 33). In many southern colonies tutors were frequently employed via a private arrangement between the head of a family and the tutor with no public, official steps taken to dictate the conditions of employment (Elsbree, 1939, p. 55).

No single statement can be used to portray the economic status of teachers during the colonial period. There is much evidence, however, to substantiate that school masters complained a good deal about their wages. The average colonial teacher was considered "a cheap commodity and an unproductive worker." The larger the community, usually the larger the salary paid; the more settled the community and the more power of the church, the larger the salary (Elsbree, 1939, pp. 84-85).

The tenure of the typical school master of the colonial period was brief. The average length of experience in Dedham, Massachusetts, between 1644 and 1757 was one year and ten months. Reasons for such short tenure included: (a) low wages, (b) political and religious affiliation, (c) teaching was thought of as a stepping stone to a more respectable profession (Elsbree, 1939, pp. 81-83).

Between 1776 and 1836, the qualifications required of teachers were not greatly improved. The academy was begun. The special preparation of teachers with greater emphasis on methodology and pedagogical principles had not at this point received general acceptance and credence (Elsbree, 1939, p. 141).

During the colonial period there were no state school systems. The first state system came into being about 1820. In 1825 the evolution of state certification procedures began (Kinney, 1964, p. 44; Stinnett et al., 1976, p. 83). In that year the Ohio legislature provided that county examining officers would start to examine candidates for teaching, and for those qualifying, issue certificates. Between 1841 and 1900, teacher certification was shared by state and county authorities, being almost completely based on the examination system. New York was the first state in 1849 to accept evidence of credit from its normal school as a basis of certification instead of an examination (Conant, 1963, pp. 9-10; Stinnett et al., 1976, p. 85).

From 1836 until the close of the Civil War was possibly the most significant period in the history of the teaching profession. To follow are listed some of the professional developments related to teacher experience and training that make this twenty-eight year period so important to the history of teacher employment practices:

1. Establishment of the public normal school where teachers were trained (Elsbree, 1939, pp. 139-141; Haskew & McLendon, 1968, p. 159).
2. The rise and development of the teacher institute where teachers were given inservice.
3. County and state supervision of schools, thus giving greater unity to the profession and vastly improving educational programs.

4. Development of organizations for teachers (Elsbree, 1939, pp. 141-142).

The late 19th century saw teaching developing toward a profession and an upgrading of the qualifications of those hired. The United States Office of Education was established to gather and disseminate information about schools. The first regional accrediting association was formed to raise the standards of secondary schools. The recommendations of the Committee of Ten in 1893 and the Committee on Reorganization of Secondary Education were also very important to teacher professionalism (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, p. 189). Professional improvements were brought about by such leaders as Mann and Bernard who favored administrative reform, sound leadership, and the need for professional training for teachers. Many elementary teachers had training in academies, and many faculty members had at least attended college (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, p. 184).

The late 19th century brought urban population increases due to immigrations and industrial expansion. Advances in school methodology which included new techniques of persons like Pestalozzi, Herbart, and Froebel were seen in these urban areas. From 1865-1920 public high school enrollments increased sixfold, which certainly reflected the rising public acceptance and support of universal secondary schooling, thus creating a need for the hiring of additional teachers to accommodate the additional numbers of students. More than half of the eligible age children were enrolled in elementary schools by 1920. By this year the average elementary pupil attended about 90 of the 160 days in a standard school year. Even with all the advances in professional preparation and increased needs for teachers in this era, teaching in the elementary school had become a "petticoat profession." Many young ladies taught for a while before they got married. Secondary school masters all too often were the type depicted by Icabod Crane. Even college teachers used their teaching in order to advance to something else (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, pp. 186-188).

At the end of the 19th century a highly structured system of certification had evolved. This system was unsuited to select teachers who could cope with the new demands in public schools and who had the adaptability to meet their new required functions. College preparation was recognized as a necessity for certification. In summary, moves had been in the certification area from local to county and state control of certification, from exams to institution credits for certification, from education requirements to special and specific subjects and levels, and from teaching only, to non-teaching positions (Kinney, 1964, pp. 79-80).

Extensive literature on the science and art of teaching was developed. During the first quarter of the 20th century, however, most teachers entered the profession with a two-year normal school preparation. Master's degrees were held by only a few (Walter, 1975, p. 19). There eventually came into being doctoral degrees in educational administration, educational psychology, curriculum and instruction, and history and philosophy of education. Laws were established to require courses of education to be taken by all candidates for certification. Teaching "majors" began to be required (Conant, 1963, pp. 11-12). Even so, in 1930-31 the results of a national survey of teachers found that 6% of elementary and more than 1% of secondary teachers had never attended any institution of higher education. Some had attended two-year institutions. Only 10% of elementary and 80% of secondary teachers had bachelor's degrees (Grant, 1973, p. 19).

Until just recently, most school districts in the United States were very small socio-political organizations that exhibited close interpersonal relationships. Paternalism in many school districts was common. Almost all members of the teaching staffs were permanent residents of the community. A large portion of the teaching personnel had actually grown up in the community in which they eventually taught. Authority and obedience relationships usually existed between the teaching staff and its superiors. This was due partially to the fact that teaching had become a feminized profession (Walter, 1975, p. 18).

After World War I elementary schools included 95% of the eligible age children. In the 1940's secondary schools hit the 90% level. In the 1960's it was found that 50% of secondary school students entered college. Single salary-type pay schedules, state adopted textbooks, and accreditation standards are believed to have bolstered schools and the teaching profession in areas that would have lagged far behind otherwise (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, pp.190-191).

Due to the teacher shortage after World War I, exams were no longer the sole basis for teacher certification (Kinney, 1964, p. 87). Also included were academic training, professional courses, requirements for certification, recommendations, and the wishes of prospective employers (Waller, 1965, p. 27). State laws in many states began to determine the methods for certification. Laws also usually began to govern the procedures by which appointments to teaching positions were made (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, p. 274). In 1956 it was found that 34% of elementary teachers didn't have their bachelor's degrees, while 3% of secondary teachers did not have their bachelor's. By 1971 only 5% of the elementary teachers employed did not have their four-year degree, while only 1% of the secondary teachers did not (Grant, 1973, p. 29).

Employment of teachers in public schools became a legal responsibility of the local school board. These boards used the prescribed programs of teacher education and certification procedures from the state to protect against individual incompetence (Conant, 1963, p. 56). Teachers came to be considered as public employees, though not in all instances subject to the same regulations as other governmental workers. Statewide minimum salaries and local salaries were normally established by legislatures or regulations (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, p. 274).

While many teachers and teacher union officials would not agree, teacher salaries have gradually improved above the rate of improvement of wage and salary workers in all industries (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, inside cover). During the 1960's the average instructional staff salary in all the schools in the United States increased 77.8% with a high of 101% increase in Maine and a low of 56% increase in Oklahoma (Burrup, 1972, p. 337). Preparation for teaching had lengthened to above the four-year degree in this 1960's period (Haskew & McLendon, 1968, inside cover).

Having briefly examined the history of teacher employment practices in the United States to nearly the present time, only the most recent national trends need to be cited. The National Education Association conducts a poll of its members every five years to find out some of the general characteristics of teachers employed. The two reports which are the most recent, Spring of 1971 and 1976, cite findings which seem to indicate trend development. It should be kept in mind that the respondents to the survey were National Education Association members only. The 1971 poll found that nationwide teachers were younger, better educated, but less experienced, and better paid than they were ten years before the study. Academic preparation of teachers had improved greatly since 1961.

Teachers without degrees had almost disappeared from the profession. In 1961, 15% of teachers did not even have a bachelor's degree. At the time of the 1971 study, 42% of men and 19% of women teachers had a master's degree or six years of preparation. Nationwide, teachers reported a strong interest in continuing education and professional growth. In the three years before the 1971 poll, 61% of the teachers had earned a mean of 14 semester hours of college credit beyond the bachelor's degree. Six of ten had participated in workshops sponsored by their school systems (NEA Research Division, 1972).

The National Education Association again prepared their report which was called The Status of the American Public School Teacher for 1975-76. In this report it was stated that about 99% of 1976 teachers questioned and responding held at least a bachelor's degree, compared with 85.4% in 1961 and 93% in 1966. The percentage of teachers with a master's or a six-year diploma as their highest degree was up from 23% in 1961 and 1966 to 37% in 1976. More secondary teachers, 44.5%, had master's degrees or six-year diplomas than did elementary teachers, 29.3%. Nationally, teachers were participating in increasing their training. About 68% of the 2976 teachers had participated in workshops sponsored by school systems in the past three years before the survey year. This was an increase from 58.6% in 1971. About 63% of the teachers questioned had earned college credit since their graduation in the three years before the survey.

As responses related to teaching experience, the NEA 1975-76 report indicated that nearly one in three of all teachers responding had entered into the teaching profession within the past five years. The number of twenty-year teachers had decreased from 31% to 17% since 1966. The collective experience of teachers had decreased from a mean of 12 to a mean of 10 years during the decade before the report. Small systems had lower median teacher experience figures than did larger systems. The median years of total teaching experience in small systems was six, down from eight in the earlier report.

Geographically, the NEA reported that the most noteworthy information gathered that relates to teacher experience was the decrease in teaching experience levels in the Southeast United States since 1966. The years of total experience had decreased from a high of 11 years in 1966 to 7 years in 1976. The percentage of twenty-year teachers in the Southeast had fallen from 38% in 1966 to 15% in 1976.

These changes in experience levels have brought the Southeast more in line with the rest of the country.

The 1975-76 NEA report states that salary schedules for teachers typically contain increments recognizing longevity and advanced preparation. The percent increase in mean salary of teachers with a bachelor's degree has been smaller than for those with master's degrees or higher. Percentage increases in salary since 1966 in the mean salary of teachers of age 30 and older is significantly greater than for teachers under age 30 and is greater for teachers over age 40 than for those under that age.

National educational and economic conditions are beginning to cause the tenured teacher, who previously was almost "guaranteed" salary raises and jobs until he/she reached the maximum of the salary schedule, to take a second look at his/her job security. While it is true that the general history of teacher employment and compensation patterns indicate reward for increased professional preparation and salary improvement, because of the birth rate decline in the 1960's and increasing inflation causing budget deficits, many school districts like Philadelphia, Detroit, Toledo, and Cleveland are required to cut even more deeply into an already streamlined budget. They are not at all sure that they can afford to keep school open for the entire school year ("City Schools in Crisis," 1977, p. 63).

Even though the teaching profession is still the largest profession in the United States in terms of the numbers employed, the NEA has reported that a little more than half of the teacher graduates in 1976 who sought jobs got jobs, leaving about 90,000 graduates without teaching positions ("NEA Survey: No Teacher Surplus," 1977, p. 32A). The teaching profession in the United States is the most depressed profession. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicted that by 1985 there will be an 11% decrease in the number of high school teachers needed (Main, November 1977, pp. 62-63). These trends, along with the knowledge that Proposition 13 (a tax reform measure passed in California in June of 1978) may be repeated in states other than California, make the prospects for any increase in teacher employment slim. If other states pass similar measures, state and local school districts will be forced to devise measures to even more drastically cut school budgets. Various measures have already been tried to determine which teachers will be eliminated if cuts are necessitated or new procedures are required for promotions. The move for accountability has seen proposals like the one designed in the Baltimore School District which will judge teachers and hinge their promotions on how much improvement their students have shown in their work ("City Schools in Crisis," 1977, p. 67).

If the need for teacher layoffs does increase, districts and unions seem very insistent in their preference for seniority as a criteria. National teacher groups are adamant in their stand for absolute seniority (Downey, 1976, p. 18). This seniority insistence will probably greatly affect the average amount of teacher experience and subsequently, the level of teacher training. With the highest paid teachers being retained through seniority, districts are going to be faced with continued budget crises.

The history of pertinent teacher hiring practices in the United States can be summarized by stating that from the earliest colonial times teachers were hired and/or paid more when they possessed more training and/or experience. The assumption that experience and/or training makes better teachers was well established in practice before it was incorporated into certification systems and salary schedules as they evolved both at the state and local levels. Present economic conditions and moves toward accountability have caused school districts to examine the practice of using experience and/or training as determinants for salary reward.

Types of Salary Schedule Plans

There have been distinct teacher salary development phases in the United States. The first three of these phases that are to follow have been described by Joseph A. Kershaw and Roland N. McKean (1962).

Bargain Approach

The first stage of salary development which was prevalent until the beginning of the 20th century was the bargain approach. This approach occurred between the individual teacher and the school board or hiring agency. The level of the salary bargained would depend upon the relative strength or the bargaining position of each party. Favoritism and a sense of unfairness was widespread with this type of salary determination. As mentioned earlier in this Review, even in colonial times preference was given in hiring to the experienced teacher. Experience and other characteristics thought to be desirable in teachers employed were rewarded in the bargain approach and the salary schedules that eventually developed.

The early salaries that were bargained frequently recognized a competitive situation by providing a higher salary for secondary school teachers than for elementary school teachers, a higher salary for men than for women, and a higher salary for experienced teachers than for inexperienced teachers.

To remove the arbitrariness of the bargaining situation, the positional schedule was developed. By 1918-19 less than one-half of cities surveyed, however, had moved away from the bargained salary to salary schedules (Davis, 1960, p. 1178).

Positional-Type Schedule

The public usually felt that almost anyone who had previously had anything to do with children would be able to teach an elementary group, while an "expert" would be required to teach in secondary school subjects. As a result, the secondary school teacher usually had more formal training than the elementary school teacher. This extra training made secondary teachers able to compete successfully with elementary teachers and forced school systems to pay more money for upper-grade level teachers in order to maintain a staff at the desired level. The positional type salary schedule developed, thus formalizing this implicit policy by prescribing higher salaries for secondary school teachers than for elementary school teachers (Tiedeman, 1952). By 1920 the positional-type reward was well established. A survey that was reported by Hazel Davis in "Salary Schedules" (1960, p. 1178), indicated that in 1919 there was no place found where elementary school teachers and secondary teachers were paid at the same level. The report did indicate that in 1920

65% of districts surveyed did have salary schedules, however.

Preparational-Type Schedule

Over the years the positional-type schedule is seen to have gradually given way to what is now called a preparational-type schedule. The typical preparational-type schedule appears like the following:

Step	Less Than Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	Master's Degree or 30 Semester Hours Beyond
1	$x1	$y1	$z1
2	$x2	$y2	$z2
3	$x3	$y3	$z3
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.
n	$xn	$yn	$zn

(Tiedeman, 1952, p. 2)

One reason that the preparational-type salary schedule replaced the positional-type schedule is that elementary school teachers have gradually gained the public's acceptance with the assertion that the elementary school teacher's responsibility is the same as the responsibility of the secondary school teacher. It can be seen that training has been substituted for position as a salary determiner in most school districts. This does not eliminate the difference in salary between the elementary and secondary teacher automatically, however. As elementary teachers were expanding their training from the two-year normal school to that of the four year teachers' colleges, secondary school teachers had begun to raise their educational level from that of the bachelor's degree to that of the master's degree. As elementary teachers are getting master's degrees, more secondary school teachers are earning additional degrees, thus generating the need to add other columns to the preparational-type schedule (Tiedeman, 1952, pp. 1-3).

The preparational salary schedule began gradually in the 1920's, picked up during the depression, and was used more and more in the war and post war years. It is now used almost universally. It has also been called the single salary schedule. The National Education Association defines it as a schedule that depends on professional qualifications measured by counting courses plus the number of years a teacher has taught. Sometimes the years are limited to years in the district, but sometimes credit is given for experience elsewhere. It should be mentioned that preparational-type schedules give credit for the number of years of college credit, not quality of college experience or relevance or usefulness. Experience refers to not how well a teacher has taught, but how long. The reason that the preparational schedule is called single salary schedule is because one schedule applies to all teachers. Another term that applies to this schedule is unified. The single or unified schedule came about to raise elementary school teachers' salaries. Kershaw and McKean (1962) reported that of districts surveyed, the following percentages of districts utilized the single salary schedules in the years indicated: 1922-23 used by 16%; 1940-41 used by 31.3%; 1944-45 used by 43.2%; 1946-47 used by 63.9%; 1948-49 used by 94.8%; and 1950-51 used by 97.1%. Single salary schedules are supported by the NEA and most teachers and administrators.

Salary Steps

As mentioned above, the single salary schedule that developed measured the professional qualifications of teachers by the number of courses taken and the number of years a teacher had taught. The experience factor was reflected in salary steps. Salary steps or rows did not always mean "years of experience," however. Initially, each "step" was a substitute for the merit principle used in conjunction with the positional and preparational schedule. Each step was supposed to mean that performance would determine accelerated or retarded salary growth. Via this original concept, the poor teacher was to be singled out for retarded compensation. In operation, recommendations for withheld increments were so few that "step" came to mean nothing more than "years of experience." The preparational-type schedule has come to be known as an "automatic" salary schedule. With this type of schedule, teachers who possess tenure are almost "guaranteed" salary raises until they reach the maximum of the salary schedule (Tiedeman, 1952, p. 3). Teacher salary schedules in Florida and elsewhere usually follow this pattern. They have a minimum and maximum salary listed. Yearly increments lead from the minimum to the maximum.

Other Salary Schedules

There are at least two more types of schedules that are now developing in addition to the classic three already described. These are the merit schedule and the negotiated schedule. The merit schedule uses some method of determining teacher merit or quality and pays if merit or quality is exhibited. Few people argue against the principle of higher pay for meritorious service of teachers, but there is little agreement upon how this merit should be measured.

The second category in the "Other Salary Schedules" category is that of the negotiated schedule. It may be one of the traditional schedule types described by Kershaw and McKean, or it may be modelled after a totally new concept. Today's preparational-step schedules represent the thinking of the past. Experience and training rewards are a well established part of that past. There is no limit as to what can be developed for the future; however, with the advent of collective bargaining, negotiated salary schedules are generally constrained only by the requirement that they meet with the approval of both sides of the bargaining table. Regardless of what types of schedules evolve, it is certain that the existing patterns, with all their inequities, are improvements over methods of salary determination utilized early in the history of teacher compensation.

The Minimum Foundation Program Salary Allocation

The drafters of the Florida Constitution in 1858 wrote this requirement into the state's basic law: "The Legislature shall provide for a uniform system of public free schools and shall provide for the liberal maintenance of same." It is toward this end that the people of Florida have been working. The first large step toward this obligation was taken in the late 1930's with the adoption of the school code. Another significant step was taken in 1947 when the Florida Legislature enacted a comprehensive school plan that came to be known as the Minimum Foundation Program. Fifteen lay members of the Florida Citizens' Committee on Education worked for nearly three years with hundreds of citizens and school personnel in preparing recommendations for education (Florida's Minimum Foundation Program ...for Our Children, 1957, p. 3). Their recommendations insisted on increasing financial support for all schools in Florida, increasing salaries of teachers, and providing "high qualifications for instructional personnel in training, ability, and personal qualities" (Hall, 1953-54, p. 14).

These recommendations were drafted into the 1947 law that was to be known as the Minimum Foundation Program. The foundation program concept had begun in New York State when Paul Mort of Columbia University wrote the original foundation program there. Basically, a foundation plan is a plan for equilization in distribution of all or part of a state's funds for the public schools (Johns, 1966, pp. 3-4). This Minimum Foundation Program based the amount of funding given to each district on instructional units. It did encourage high qualifications for instructional personnel, and additional state funds were provided for instructional personnel of higher training and experience (Hall, 1953-54, pp. 1-2).

There were three basic steps for determining funding under the MFP. Step one is the only step that relates specifically to the topic of this study. In this step, the cost of providing the minimum educational opportunity considered as reasonable and essential is calculated by including funds for teachers' salaries. Districts were allocated funds for salaries which included reward for increased training and experience (Florida's Minimum Foundation Program ...for Our Children, 1957, pp. 5-6).

According to Dr. R. L. Johns, the salary portion of the MFP was originally intended to encourage districts to hire better qualified teachers (Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education, 1973, p. 113). This was done because there was a fear at the time that MFP was drafted that if the state did not mandate minimum salaries, some of the districts in Florida would hire the cheapest teachers possible. These teachers might be untrained and have insufficient educational backgrounds in education or academic areas. While the MFP did not establish a state salary schedule for teachers, it did put a floor on salaries to guarantee that the districts in Florida didn't fall below some kind of a minimum in hiring teachers in relation to the teachers' educational credentials. In some Florida counties, there was also some fear that there would be some discrimination against black teachers' salaries as compared with white teachers' salaries if there was not a uniform state salary floor to discourage such a practice. The state salary provisions of the MFP, therefore, used the preparational and salary step-approach by rewarding districts who, in turn, rewarded teachers who possessed more experience and training. Such rewards were based on the assumption that additional training and more experience improve teacher performance (Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education, 1973, pp. 113-114).

The Florida Handbook, 1965-66 (pp. 189-192) explains how the salary portion of the MFP worked. Basically, the MFP program costs were determined by considering the number of children in school and the training and experience of the teacher that was required to teach them. Instructional salaries made up the major portion or the cost of the MFP. While county school systems determined their teacher salary schedules, the MFP provided allotments by rank for the instructional personnel based on the training and experience levels of teachers. At the time the 1965-66 edition of the *Florida Handbook* was written, the following allocations were made by the state and county school systems in the MFP for each rank of certification, and are cited as an example of how the MFP salary allocations worked:

Rank I	-Advanced Post Graduate Certificate Based on an earned Doctor's Degree from a standard institution of higher learning and on such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the State Board of Education	$5,000
Rank II	-Post Graduate Certificate Based on an earned Master's Degree	$4,400
Rank III	-Graduate Certificate	$3,950
Rank IV	-Temporary Certificate Based on 90 or more semester hours of college credit, but less than an earned degree	$3,000
Rank V	-Temporary Certificate Based on 60 to 89 semester hours of college credit (*Florida Handbook*, *1965-66*, p. 190)	$2,800

Each teacher was to be paid by each district at least 90% of the salary allocation for his rank. Starting in 1957, units that were sustained by teachers on continuing contract were allocated an additional $400; units sustained by teachers on continuing contract with ten years of efficient teaching service in Florida public schools were allocated an additional $400. No teacher on continuing contract was paid less then $4,000 annually. The minimum was increased to $5,000 after ten years of teaching service in the state of Florida public schools. In 1968, if a teacher had taught successfully for 15 years, an additional $600 was allocated to the district for the teacher's salary (*Florida's Minimum Foundation Program ...for Our Children*, 1957, p. 7). It is significant to note that under the provisions of the MFP when the district salary schedule was substantially higher than the state minimum schedule, the district had to finance most of the burden of hiring teachers with more experience and training.

Under the MFP and its salary provisions, Florida made much educational progress. In 1950 the results of an evaluation of Florida's Public Schools conducted by the School of Public Administration personnel of Florida State University, were reported to the Legislative Reference Bureau. This report which is cited in the 1965-66 Florida Handbook, stated that from 1947 until the time of the study, Florida had made more progress in education than in any comparable period in history. This report indicated that the 1947 law, The Minimum Foundation Program, brought about an increase in expenditures which provided better opportunities for all children, better equalization of educational opportunities, better qualified teachers, more instructional supplies, better school facilities, more adequate transportation, and a tenth month for planning and evaluation. Thomas D. Bailey, past Commissioner of Education for the State of Florida, gives credit to the MFP for closing unsatisfactory schools, bringing about increased training and competence of Florida teachers, enriching curriculum offerings in cultural and vocational subjects, providing better teaching materials, and bringing about growth in pupil achievement, health, and welfare. He further stated that in 1952, Florida's children were being taught by teachers whose training ranked among the best in the nation. At that time 93.5% of the teachers in Florida were college graduates. Many had additional credit and additional degrees (Florida Handbook, 1965-66, p. 190). In 1964, 99.19% had four years of college preparation.

Between 1947 and 1973 subsequent legislative improvements expanded and strengthened the MFP. When the foundation plan was originated by Mort and his students years ago, they thought it was the ideal plan for state support. Johns, who used the plan for the MFP, said, "At that time and for many years thereafter, it was the ideal plan as compared with other alternatives." Mort, his students, and others have continued to research methods of state support. Now it is generally agreed that the foundation plan alone is not the ideal plan for the present time (Johns, 1966, pp. 3-4).

The Florida Education Finance Program

In spite of the gains made under the MFP, in 1971 the Governor of Florida was concerned that Florida faced an educational dilemma due to court decisions and the desire for the equity goal. He, too, formed a committee to study the problem. The committee that was formed was made up of people from the Legislature, business, industry, labor, the professions, and minority groups. This Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education, hereafter called the "Schultz Committee," made its report in 1973. The MFP had been amended by the Legislature again and again since 1947. Many people believed it had become too complicated (Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education, 1973, p. 47). State officials began to comb the thick volumes of current school law to determine which restrictions on local officials' freedom of action could be eliminated. Some leaders in the Legislature said that those laws that were originally passed to insure that local officials met minimum standards of class size, teacher qualifications and salaries, and many other requirements had begun to impede educational reform. Kenneth MacKay, a Florida legislator, expressed these feelings when he said, "In regulating against disaster, we find we've been regulating mediocrity" (Morganthau, 1973, p. 1B).

The Schultz Committee recommended that the foundation program concept (the Strayer Haig Formula) be retained, but that the formula be simplified and made more equitable. Most of the committee's recommendations were enacted into law by the 1973 Legislature. The goal for the funding formula was to avoid needless complexity and base the formula on concepts that could be understood by laymen. The revised formula from the MFP was renamed the Florida Education Finance Program. The principal changes included:

1. The basic unit for determining the cost of the state guaranteed program was changed from the weighted instruction unit based on Average Daily Attendance to a student unit based on a full-time equivalent student.
2. Full-time equivalent students were weighted in terms of computed or desired cost differentials for different grade levels and different types of programs.
3. A schedule of cost of living differentials was included.
4. Each district's share of the required local effort was determined by computing its percentage of non-exempt assessed valuation of the state property assessed at 100% of just value (Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education, 1973, pp. 85-90).

The Florida Education Finance Program eliminated the state salary floor provisions as a basis for distributing money to districts. The two major reasons for the salary allocation under the MFP, (a) to prevent districts from hiring the cheapest teachers possible, and (b) to prevent some districts from discriminating against black teachers, seemed to be outdated to even those who had written the MFP. It was felt that state certification requirements assured that local educational agencies could not hire below minimum acceptable standards. Discrimination against blacks should be taken care of by the federal Civil Rights Act. The Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education had examined the research that related to reasons for keeping a salary schedule that rewarded training and experience. They found no substantial research indicating that additional college courses make a person a better teacher. Further, they had found that while experience seems to improve teaching performance for a few years, after these first few years, there is little additional improvement. They felt that the state salary schedule provisions were rewarding things that were unimportant to teaching performance, and were, therefore, dysfunctional (Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education, 1973, p. 114). These conclusions were based on certain research findings which are summarized below. Additionally, more recent findings which confirm the questionable nature of teacher experience and training as a measure of effectiveness are also presented.

There has been much research conducted concerning the effectiveness of teachers. Studies that relate specifically to the experience and training dimensions of a teacher's preparation and his/her effectiveness are only a small portion of teacher effectiveness studies. They are the only dimensions which will be discussed here, however.

Few persons would assert that more length of service in a school system is a guarantee that a teacher is a good teacher. Actually, research evidence varies concerning the relationship between experience and success in teaching. Some of the earliest studies (Barthelemess & Boyer, 1928, pp. 521-535; Boardman, 1928, p. 85; Boyce, 1912, pp. 144-157; Davis & French, 1928, pp. 57, 60-64; Knight, 1928) yield correlation ratios from .04 to .43. Other studies have higher correlations between experience and efficiency up to .75 (Ackerman, 1954; Betts, 1935, pp. 143-251; Davis, 1934, p. 101; Moss, Lowan, & Hunt, 1929, pp. 40-50; Ritter, 1918, pp. 740-756; Rolfe, 1954, pp. 52-74). Barthelemess and Boyer (1928, pp. 521-535), Bossing (1931) and Young (1937, pp. 24-25) found efficiency ratings increased with experience up to between five and 13 years, and then leveled off. Morsh and Wilder (1971) summarize their findings in a review of studies on teacher effectiveness and its relationship to experience by relating that there does appear to be some correlation between the experience of a teacher and efficiency. As a teacher gains his first five years of experience, he improves. After five years he reaches a plateau and his performance varies little during the next 15-20 years. In more recent studies, Dunkin and Biddle (1974, pp. 357-410) report a study in which it was found that younger teachers worked more effectively than experienced teachers with students with low achievement motivation, while more experienced teachers were more effective with students who possessed high achievement motivation.

In another recent study, Levin (1974, pp. 5-15) found that two teacher characteristics, the number of years that a teacher had taught and the teacher's own verbal scores on tests, are related to an increase in verbal scores of students. Using a sample of 3000 teachers, the researcher found that from a cost effectiveness standpoint, it was ten times more efficient to hire teachers with higher verbal scores than to hire more experienced teachers to increase student scores. It was further noted that teachers with the highest verbal scores were those with no teaching experience. Teachers with three or more years of experience showed significantly lower scores than those with less than three years of experience. Some would contend that there might be some policy implications here for hiring and retention of verbally able teachers, rather than paying so much attention to experience.

In summarizing the relationship between teacher experience and student achievement, a recent report, Forecasts of Selected Social Indicators of Educational Outcomes and Recommended Policy Changes (Collazo, Lewis, & Thomas, 1976), indicated that there does seem to be some evidence that teacher experience is related to student achievement.

For years it had been assumed that additional hours of education add up to more competent teaching. Davis and French (1928, p. 63) report that the relation between "professional training" and ratings of teachers by county superintendents and other officials was .41 in a groups of 156 teachers. They concluded that "a high degree of professional training (is) not concomitant with a high rating as a teacher."

Davis (1934, p. 101) reported that students of teachers who had not had specialized training in the subjects they taught scored higher on subject matter achievement tests than did students of teachers who had received such training. Chemistry was one major exception. Pupils of qualified teachers (a college major or minor in chemistry) far exceeded those of the teacher without such specialized training. In a study by Hughes (1925, pp. 292-302) physics pupils of teachers who had specialized in physics made average scores above the mean scores of all those who took the test. These results seem to lead to the conclusion that in certain highly technical areas, the training of the teacher in the subject matter is of great importance. In other areas this does not seem to be the case.

There is some evidence that teachers with more professional knowledge (as measured by the National Teachers Exam) tend to be more effective teachers, but there is not as strong a relationship as one would expect (Ellena & Stinson, 1961). Turner and Fatter (1960, p. 60) found that those who had completed methods courses were more effective than those who had not. DeRuzzo (1973, pp. 321-322) reported a positive correlation between student achievement and the percentage of a school's faculty with master's degrees. Graduate preparation, independent of degrees, was positively associated with student achievement (Bowles, 1971).

In Forecasts of Selected Social Indicators of Education Outcomes and Recommended Policy Changes (1976, p. 23), it was stated that some relationship exists between teacher effectiveness and the teacher's training, but this relationship is not nearly as significant as other variables that have a stronger effect on educational outcomes. These more significant variables include family background, racial-ethnic group, region and type of community, school resources, and facilities. This report further states that the education of the teacher beyond the bachelor's degree is not related to better student achievement.

The Governor's Citizens' Committee of Education (1973) summarized the research they had studied on the relationship between levels of teacher training and teacher effectiveness. They felt that there was "no substantial research indicating that additional college courses make a better teacher." The training research cited above does seem to indicate that training does make a great deal of difference in certain specialized fields, however. Evidence is contradictory as to the relationship between increased teacher training in non-specialized fields.

It was the early research presented above and the emerging trends in more recent research that prompted the Governor's Citizens' Committee of Education to carefully consider the traditional practice of rewarding experience and training of teachers in a state salary allocation. Due to the inconclusive nature of the research findings, they decided to recommend the elimination of such provisions at the state level.

As a result of the elimination of the state minimum salary provisions, local school districts are no longer bound to the preparational-step approach to teacher salaries. Districts are no longer bound to give incentives for increased experience and/or training. They may do so if they desire, however. The money from state allocations may be spent in any legal way the district desires. The full-time equivalent student--the child--is the base for funding. The teacher with his training and experience is not. The districts are bound by the state only in that they must expend funds for salaries in accordance with a salary schedule or schedules adopted by the district school board. The determinants for reward in these salary schedules are a local matter.

While the purpose of the FEFP was to change the formula for funding education to make it less complicated and to use the child as the basis for allocations to districts, such changes instituted might also bring along with them other changes not necessarily anticipated. One of these areas of possible change is related to teacher employment patterns or practices. By allowing greatly increased latitude at the local level as to how state money would be spent, as long as the spending was within the liberalized guidelines, it might be possible that the claim of the MFP--that it assured "high qualifications for instructional personnel in training, ability, and personal qualities"--would no longer apply to the state of Florida educational system. Districts would still be required to adopt a salary schedule or schedules, but since local districts would no longer be required to pay for their teachers' experience and training, would experience and training become a "luxury item" that would not be purchased by local school districts? Would there be any major changes in teacher employment practices as they relate to experience, training, and compensation patterns in Florida districts subsequent to the passage and implementation of the Florida Education Finance Program legislation?

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA: TEACHER EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND COMPENSATION PATTERNS BEFORE THE 1973 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, to identify any significant trends in Florida teacher employment practices relative to teacher experience, training, and compensation patterns occurring since the enactment and implementation of the Florida Education Finance Program, information was gathered from pre and post-1973 sources. Presented in this chapter are pre-1973 data gathered from the following sources:

1. Existing documents that relate teacher experience and training levels;
2. Actual salary schedules and salary compilations;
3. Survey responses from Florida school districts and Florida Education Association United Locals.

Existing Documents

Documents reviewed reported that before the institution of the Minimum Foundation Program there was a much higher rate of mobility than should exist if teachers were to build themselves into the life of the community and assure proper continuity for programs. In 1945 an analysis of teaching experience of white teachers in representative counties recorded 3% of teachers with no experience; 16% had one to five years of experience; 17% had six to ten years; 34% had 11 to 20 years; and 23% had from 21 to 30 years. It was reported that 7% had more than 30 years of experience. The study that generated these figures further indicated that one out ten teachers at that time had no previous experience in Florida, and that only one of ten teachers had taught in his/her county more than five years. The Florida Citizens' Committee on Education (1947) which reported this study further reported that evidence indicated a marked movement from county to county as a result of salary differentials. It was hoped that the Minimum Foundation Program would greatly improve this condition.

Teacher training levels from 1930 to 1945-47 were constantly increasing (Florida Citizens' Committee on Education, 1947, p. 161). These increasing training level trends continued under the Minimum Foundation Program. Training levels were reported in the Florida Handbook 1965-66 (p. 190). At that time 93.5% of the teachers of Florida were college graduates. Many had additional credit and additional degrees.

Before 1947, as reported in Education and the Future of Florida: A Study of Education in Florida (1947), an analysis of practice showed great variety in teacher salary schedules in the State of Florida. Some of the factors that were used for determining salaries included college training, 62 counties; experience, 55 counties; quality of service as determined by merit ratings, 11 counties; type of certificate, 41 counties; and objective examinations, 3 counties. Many counties based their schedules exclusively on training and experience. One county made no distinction for experience. The foundation program was proposed as a logical step in achieving the goal of establishing a minimum salary to be paid to four year professionally prepared beginning teachers. Many persons felt that soundly constructed schedules for salaries in accord with "accepted principles of recognition for training, experience and ability" should be used. Many felt that there should be one salary schedule for all teachers of comparable training, experience, and competence, elementary and secondary, black and white, men and women, and general and special.

Salary Schedules

The institution of the Minimum Foundation Program did bring a degree of uniformity to Florida teacher salary schedules. By allocating funds to districts recognizing experience and training as salary determinants, the state legitimized the preparational-step salary schedule that was eventually to become used almost universally.

Harold F. Riehle (1952) solicited actual salary schedules from all Florida districts in 1951-52 for an unpublished study. The schedules he received illustrated the use of the preparational-step type schedule. A review of these schedules reveals that in 1951-52, five years after the MFP was instituted, all of the Florida school districts had salary schedules that had minimum and maximum annual salaries for personnel, giving credit for experience (average of 10.98 years) and training as determined by rank classification. Twelve districts did not give salary credit for Rank I certificate. No districts gave credit for Rank IA. Five districts included a merit concept in salary adjudication. The average salary range of all districts during 1951-52 allowed for a 64% increase from minimum to maximum salary (see Table 1 for a brief summary of 1951-52 salary data; a more complete compilation can be found in Appendix B).

TABLE 1

BRIEF SUMMARY OF 1951-52 FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION

Characteristic observed	Districts displaying characteristic		
	Number	Percentage	
Ranges listed from minimum to maximum	67	100	Average years of experience rewarded = 10.98
Average percent of increase from minimum to maximum		64	
Salary reward for:			Salary schedules showed no
Rank I	54*	82	evidence of column rewards.
Rank IA	0*	0	Increments were given annually with size
Rank II	66*	100	of increments varying from district
Rank III	66*	100	to district.

*No Rank Data for one district, Walton.

The State Department of Education maintains actual salary schedules for recent years as part of each district's annual budget. Information relative to 1972-73 salary schedules, the last year under the MFP, was extracted from these budget documents by the author of this study. In 1972-73 all salary schedules had minimum and maximum annual salaries. In these preparational-step type schedules, credit was given for experience (15.78 years average) and training in all districts. Forty-three of the districts gave column rewards for continuing contract (CC), CC with seven years of experience, CC with ten years, and CC with fifteen years of experience. Only Martin, Okeechobee and Suwanee counties did not give salary credit for Rank I in 1972-73. All districts but Martin and Lake Counties gave salary credit for Rank IA. The average range of salaries for all districts from minimum to maximum allowed an 80% increase in 1972-73 (see Table 2 for a brief summary of 1972-73 salary data; a more detailed compilation is available in Appendix C).

Information Obtained from Survey Responses

A survey instrument was prepared by the author of this study and sent to representatives of the 67 school districts in Florida and the 42 Florida Education Association United Locals (see Appendix D). There were 65 responses from the Florida school districts. When follow-up interviews were scheduled with representatives of selected districts, the two districts which failed to respond by mail were included. As a result, a response rate of 100% from Florida school districts was achieved. Responses were received from 28 of the 42 FEA Locals surveyed, yielding a response rate of 67%. A high

TABLE 2

BRIEF SUMMARY OF 1972-73 FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION

Characteristic observed	Districts displaying characteristic		Columns Rewarded	No. of districts rewarding columns
	Number	Percentage		
Ranges listed from minimum to maximum	67	100	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15	43
			AC CC CC-6 CC-10	1
			AC CC plus increments	1
Average percent of increase from minimum to maximum		80		
			AC CC CC-6	2
			AC CC CC-7	1
			AC CC	6
			AC CC CC-10	3
			AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15 CC-20	1
Salary reward for:				
Rank I	64	95	AC CC CC-7 CC-10	1
Rank IA	65	97	AC CC CC-10 CC-15	2
Rank II	67	100	Index	1
Rank III	67	100	No data	5

The average years of experience rewarded was 15.78

percentage of survey forms were completed adequately, but a few of the questions were not answered by all respondents. There were also some inconsistencies in responses. Several of the respondents failed to give actual years of experience, but chose to respond with approximations. When relating information concerning levels of training, respondents also answered with approximations and sometimes used different measures of training levels.

The summary narrative and Table 3 that are to follow describe the results of survey responses from Florida school districts and profile groupings concerning the pre-1973 era.

Florida School Districts

Experience. Respondents from Florida districts were unanimous in their confirmation that before 1973 salary reward was given for experience. There were 15 responses that indicated that the average level of teacher experience had been increasing before 1973, while only four responses indicated that the average level of teacher experience had been decreasing before 1973. A total of 22 district representatives reported that the level of teacher experience had remained constant. Sufficient responses were given to be able to reach conclusions concerning the numerical average of teacher experience levels before 1973. Of the 17 responses, the average years listed was 9.6 years.

Training. Respondents indicated that 91% of the districts rewarded additional training prior to 1973. There may have been some misunderstanding relative to the meaning of the question, since a review of salary schedules for 1972-73 indicate that all

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY--PRE-1973

	District Totals		Group	Group	Group	Group	Group
	Number	%	1	2	3	4	5
Rewarded experience	67	100	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Experience increasing before 1973	15		4	4	2	2	3
Experience decreasing before 1973	4		0	0	0	1	3
Average number of years of teacher experience = 9.66							
Rewarded training	59* *2 No response	91	100%	66%	83%	83%	66%
Training increasing before 1973	10		1	4	1	2	2
Training decreasing before 1973	5		0	0	0	2	3
Average level of teacher training = 4.12							

Florida districts gave credit for additional training. There were 10 respondents who indicated that their district had been experiencing an increase in the average amount of teacher training before 1973, while representatives of only five districts reported decreasing teacher training levels. Eighteen persons stated that the training level in their district had remained constant throughout the years of concern to this study. Estimates or approximations of average teacher training levels by number of years were not received in sufficient numbers to be of use to this study. Responses that were received were invalid since different measures of training levels were apparently used. From those responses listed, only eight of nine were usable, yielding an average of 4.12 years.

Florida Education Association United Locals

The summary narrative and Table 4 that are to follow describe the results of survey responses from FEA Local representatives concerning the pre-1973 era.

Completed survey forms returned by the respondents indicated that some of the exact statistical information requested was not available to the FEA representatives. The approximations and perceptions are based upon their best judgements, and are used as a check on the perceptions of the district representatives.

Experience. All representatives of the Florida Education Association Locals indicated that before 1973 teacher experience had been rewarded in salary schedules. Only nine responses were given to the question concerning before-1973 experience levels: five indicated increasing experience before 1973; four, decreasing. Four district

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF FLORIDA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION LOCALS SURVEY--PRE-1973

	Response Totals	
	Number	Percentage
Rewarded experience	27* *1 No response	100
Experience increasing before 1973	5	
Experience decreasing before 1973	4	
Average number of years of teacher experience = Insufficient responses		
Rewarded training	21	75
Training increasing before 1973	4	
Training decreasing before 1973	1	
Average level of teacher training = Insufficient and invalid responses		

responses indicated that experience levels had remained constant.

Training. When responding to questions concerning salary reward for training before 1973, 75% of respondents indicated that increased training credit was given. Salary schedules examined did not agree with this perception. Schedules indicated that all districts rewarded training before 1973. Very few responses were received to the question concerning increasing or decreasing levels before 1973. Only four persons indicated levels of training increasing before 1973, while only one person reported training levels decreasing. Seven responses indicated that training levels had remained constant. The response to actual or approximations of years of teacher training was insufficient to determine an average.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA: TEACHER EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND COMPENSATION PATTERNS AFTER THE 1973 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLORIDA EDUCATION FINANCE PROGRAM

Contained in this chapter is post-1973 information obtained from the following sources:

1. Existing documents that relate teacher experience and training levels;
2. Actual salary schedules and salary compilations;
3. Survey responses from Florida school districts and Florida Education United Locals.

Existing Documents

Since the implementation of the Florida Education Finance Program in 1973, many statistics which were formerly gathered and maintained by the State Department of Education relative to teacher experience and/or training were discontinued. A search was made of records at the Department of Education to determine if teacher experience levels for the last year of the Minimum Foundation Program were on file. They were not. A district by district listing of teacher experience levels for 1973-74, the first year after implementation of the FEFP was available, however. Since the FEFP had just been implemented during the 1973-74 school year, there probably would not have been time for any break in teacher experience trends to have occurred. To the knowledge of the author, this listing of experience levels is the only such centrally compiled post-1973 experience information. Both major teacher organizations in the state were contacted to secure such information, without success. Table 5 depicts the levels of teacher experience for each district for 1973-74. The average years of experience in the state of Florida was 9.38 years.

Salary Schedules

The State Department of Education does maintain salary schedule compilations by district for the post-1973 era. These were shared with the author. The author was also provided with actual district salary schedules for 1977-78 by the Department of Education (see Table 6 and Appendix E for summaries).

An examination of actual salary schedules for all Florida school districts for 1977-78 indicated that under FEFP all districts had minimum and maximum annual salaries. The preparational-step schedule was used by all but one district. This district used experience credit for entry on the schedule only. After initial entry, raises were negotiated and given to individuals, rather than automatic yearly increases. As summary Table 6 and Appendix E indicate, in 1977-78 six districts no longer gave salary credit and reward for Rank I. There were five districts that no longer rewarded Rank IA. Although one district listed both Rank I and IA in its schedule, there was no differentiation in payment between the two ranks.

Information Obtained from Survey Responses

Since under The Florida Education Finance Program the State Department of Education no longer maintains statistics concerning

TABLE 5

TEACHER EXPERIENCE LEVELS FOR FLORIDA DISTRICTS--1973-74

	Years		Years
Alachua	8.13	Gulf	10.79
Baker	9.71	Hamilton	12.67
Bay	10.20	Hardee	7.94
Bradford	8.14	Hendry	7.23
Brevard	8.98	Hernando	6.92
Broward	8.52	Highlands	9.34
Calhoun	12.81	Hillsborough	9.31
Charlotte	9.78	Holmes	10.99
Citrus	8.40	Indian River	11.37
Clay	6.08	Jackson	13.87
Collier	7.88	Jefferson	9.90
Columbia	10.03	LaFayette	9.26
Dade	9.89	Lake	9.88
De Soto	8.39	Lee	8.78
Dixie	7.32	Leon	9.05
Duval	10.62	Levy	8.56
Escambia	10.16	Liberty	10.66
Flagler	9.67	Madison	12.35
Franklin	7.99	Manatee	10.19
Gadsden	11.22	Marion	8.65
Gilchrist	8.58	Martin	7.99
Glades	9.93	Monroe	8.19

TABLE 5

(continued)

	Years
Nassau	7.35
Okaloosa	8.79
Okeechobee	5.61
Orange	9.46
Osceola	8.71
Plam Beach	10.96
Pasco	6.85
Pinellas	10.35
Polk	10.32
Putnam	8.84
St. Johns	9.90
St. Lucie	10.11
Santa Rosa	10.05
Sarasota	10.51
Seminole	7.57
Sumter	8.46
Suwannee	12.53
Taylor	11.64
Union	6.73
Volusia	10.14
Wakulla	5.37
Walton	12.21
Washington	9.45
Average	9.38

TABLE 6

BRIEF SUMMARY OF 1977-78 FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION

Characteristic observed	Districts displaying characteristic		Columns Rewarded	No. of districts rewarding coumns
	Number	Percentage		
Ranges listed from minimum to maximum	67	100	AC CC	12
			AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15	20
Average percent increase from minimum to maximum		78	AC CC 4-16	1
			AC CC CC-6 CC-10	2
			Base + Equivalency	1
			Increments Yearly	23
Salary reward for:			AC CC CC-6	1
Rank I	61	91	AC CC CC-7	1
Rank IA	62	92	BA + 15	1
Rank II	67	100	Raises negotiated	1
Rank III	67	100	BA+15 BA+30 MA+30 MA+45	1
			BA+18 BA+27	1
			AC CC CC-10	2

Average years of experience rewarded was 16.43

the levels of teacher experience or training in the school districts of Florida, it was necessary to circulate a data gathering instrument to the 67 districts and 42 Florida Education Association Locals to obtain this information.

Florida School Districts

The narrative that is to follow describes the results of survey responses depicted in Table 7 concerning the post-1973 era from Florida school districts and profile groupings.

Experience. Ninety-eight percent of respondents indicated that experience was rewarded in salary schedules after 1973. St. Johns County was identified as the only county in which experience credit for salary was no longer given. A letter of inquiry was sent to St. Johns County regarding this response. It was found that in 1977-78 experience steps on the St. Johns salary schedule were used only to determine entry levels of teachers. Once a teacher was placed on the salary schedule, he/she was not automatically moved up the schedule steps upon completing a year successfully until the maximum was reached. Each raise was negotiated, and the teacher remained at the entry step, but received the raise negotiated. A total of 54% of respondents from districts indicated that their district had experienced a change in the average number of years of teacher experience since 1973. A total of 22 persons from districts indicated that the district's teacher experience level had been increasing after 1973, while 11 respondents stated that district teacher experience was decreasing after 1973. Twenty-two district responses reported the teacher level of experience as remaining constant.

TABLE 7

RESULTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT SURVEY--POST-1973

Characteristic observe	District Totals Number	%	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Rewarded experience	64* *2 No response	98	100%	100%	90%	100%	100%
Experience increasing after 1973	22		5	4	2	4	7
Experience decreasing after 1973	11		2	3	1	2	3
Experience remaining constant	22		2	4	5	8	3
Experience level change	33* *6 No response	54	70%	55%	30%	59%	54%
Moves to no longer reward experience	7* *6 No response	11	18%	8%	30%	0%	6%
Average years experience = 8.67							
Rewarded training	59* *2 No response	91	70%	69%	66%	69%	81%
Training increasing after 1973	36		7	10	5	8	6
Training decreasing after 1973	3		0	0	0	1	2
Training remaining constant	18		3	3	4	5	3

TABLE 7

(continued)

Characteristic observed	District Totals		Group	Group	Group	Group	Group
	Number	%	1	2	3	4	5
Training level change	46* *3 No response	72	70	77	67	63	81
Moves to no longer reward training	6* *4 No response	9	9	15	20	0	6
Average level of training = 4.33							
Hiring of minimally experienced and trained	15	22	82%	46%	10%	23%	25%
School based management	37* *2 No response	57	73%	8%	60%	75%	59%
Desire results of survey	56* *4 No response	89	91%	77%	100%	82%	100%
Negotiated salary	62* *1 No response	94%	100%	100%	90%	100%	81%

Thirty-four districts responses listed numerical experience levels of teachers after 1973. Most of these responses were approximations, rather than actual figures. The average of these responses was 8.67 years. Most frequently listed as reasons for possible upward or downward trends in teacher experience were layoffs of least senior teachers; supply and demand; declining student population; hiring freezes; hiring new teachers for new FEFP units; and higher salaries.

Training. In response to the question as to whether credit in salaries was given after 1973, nine respondents indicated that salary credit was no longer given for advanced training after 1973. A review of salary schedules finds this response in error. The requirements for the advanced training that was rewarded may have changed, but salary credit for training was still being rewarded in all districts after 1973. Of the respondents, 72% indicated that their district had experienced a change in the average amount of teacher training. A great number of respondents, a total of 36, reported that the average amount of teacher training was increasing after 1973, while only three district responses indicated decreasing teacher training after 1973. Eighteen persons stated that the training level of the teachers in their district had remained constant throughout the years of concern to this study. From those districts whose representatives had usable approximations of training levels for the post-1973 era, an average of 4.33 years was computed.

Miscellaneous Responses. When asked if there had been moves to no longer reward increased experience, 89% of respondents indicated that they were not aware of such moves. When asked the same question relative to training, 89% indicated that they were unaware of any such moves.

The respondents from 22% of Florida school districts indicated an awareness of instances in which minimally experienced and/or trained teachers had been hired because they were cheaper than more experienced and/or trained.

School based management was being utilized in 57% of the school districts in Florida. Twelve percent of district respondents did not wish to classify their district as fully school based. They indicated that they were operating with only a degree of this type of administrative structure. A total of 94% of district responses stated that salary schedules were negotiated for the 1977-78 school year.

Florida Education Association United Locals

The narrative that is to follow describes the results of survey responses from FEA locals depicted in Table 8 concerning the post-1973 era.

Experience. All of the FEA representatives reported that their districts gave salary reward for teacher experience after 1973. Seventy-five percent of responding local officials stated that their district had experienced a change in the average number of years of teacher experience since the institution of the FEFP. Of responding locals, 65% of persons answering indicated that their district experience levels were increasing after 1973, while only 4 reported decreasing levels. Four district representatives reported constant levels.

TABLE 8

RESULTS OF FLORIDA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SURVEY--POST-1973

Characteristic observed	Responding district totals		Characteristic observed	Responding district totals	
	Number	%		Number	%
Rewarded experience	27* *1 No response	100	Rewarded training	21	75
Experience increasing after 1973	15		Training increasing after 1973	15	
Experience decreasing after 1973	4		Training decreasing after 1973	2	
Experience remaining constant	4		Training remaining constant	7	
Experience level change	18* *4 No response	75	Training level change	14* *4 No response	58
Moves to no longer reward experience	3	11	Moves to no longer reward training	6	21
Average years of experience = 9.95			Average years of training = 4.7*		
Hiring of minimally experience and trained	16	57	*Mixed measures used caused difficulties in computing average		
School based management	15* *2 No response	58			
Desire results of survey	28	100			
Negotiated salary	27* *1 No response	100			

Training. Contrary to evidence presented earlier in the 1977-78 salary schedules, 25% of FEA representatives reported that their district no longer gave training rewards. Of the 24 respondents to the question asking if the district had experienced any change in level of teacher training since 1973, 58% answered affirmatively. A total of 15 persons reported training levels increasing after 1973, while only two reported levels decreasing. The response to actual or approximated years of teacher training was so slight that certainly no implications may be drawn. Fourteen district responses did list levels of teacher training after 1973, but in different measures, making the computation of a numerical average of years difficult. Seventy percent of the respondents indicated that they were aware of factors that could cause an upward or downward trend in teacher training levels. Most commonly mentioned factors included additional universities offering programs, Teacher Education Centers, and salary increases.

Miscellaneous Responses. Eighty-nine percent of responding representatives of FEA Locals indicated that they were not aware of any moves to discontinue salary rewards for increased experience; 79% were not aware of moves to discontinue reward for increased training. A total of 57% of respondents indicated that they were aware of instances when persons were hired due to possession of minimum experience and training levels.

Of the local representatives responding, 58% indicated that they represented districts which utilized school based management. Eleven percent answered that their district had only a degree of school based management. A total of 100% of respondents reported negotiated district salary schedules.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA GATHERED FROM COMBINED SOURCES

In the previous chapter information pertaining to teacher experience and training and their reward in salary schedules in the state of Florida prior to and after the implementation of the Florida Education Finance Program was discussed. The purpose of Chapter V is to summarize, combine, compare, and analyze the information gathered from the various information sources discussed earlier. This analysis will lead to conclusions that can be made as to the direction that has been taken by Florida school districts regarding the giving of salary reward for teacher experience and/or training since the enactment of the Florida Education Finance Program.

Salary Schedule Comparisons

Under the Florida Education Finance Program salary schedules in the individual school districts maintained the preparational-step format utilized by districts under the Minimum Foundation Program (see Table 9). Districts were not bound to use this or any particular schedule format under FEFP.

Data presented have established that districts rewarded experience and training in salary schedules prior to 1973. All districts except St. Johns continued to reward these characteristics after 1973 (see Table 9). All districts continued to list ranges in 1977-78 from

TABLE 9

SALARY SCHEDULE COMPARISON

Characteristic	Pre-1973 Era 1972-1973 Schedules	Post-1973 Era 1977-1978 Schedules
Reward for experience and training	100%	100%*
Ranges listed from minimum to maximum	100%	100%
Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	80%	78%
Average years of experience rewarded	15.78	16.43
Reward for:		
Rank I	65 districts	61 districts
Rank IA	65 districts	62 districts
Rank II	67 districts	67 districts
Rank III	67 districts	67 districts
Number of Column rewards	12	13

*One district used experience credit for entry placement only in 1977-78.

minimum to maximum. The average years of experience rewarded in salaries had not changed significantly from 1973 to 1977-78. There were four fewer districts whose salary schedules rewarded Rank I certificates; three fewer that rewarded Rank IA. All districts continued to reward Rank II and Rank III. Some districts had altered requirements for the training that was rewarded since 1973.

There are significant differences to be noted in pre-1973 and post-1973 column rewards. Columns rewards are usually combinations of length of service and contract status. In 1972-73 schedules there were 12 types of column rewards. A total of 43 districts utilized the AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15 format. In 1977-78 there were 13 types of column rewards, with only 24 districts using the AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15 format. In 1972-73 there were six districts using the AC CC format. In 1977-78 the number had risen to 13. A total of 63% of districts had collapsed their schedule to fewer column rewards since 1973.

An additional point of comparison of salary schedules is the percentage increase of salary ranges from minimum to maximum. This information is of interest to this study in that the ranges represent the experience granted plus training rewarded in all districts. The listing below presents average percentage increase in salary range from minimum to maximum for each year since 1951-52 as derived from district schedule compilations:

1951-52	64.13%	1971-72	80.23%	1975-76	76.39%
1968-69	75.02%	1972-73	77.07%	1976-77	77.57%
1969-70	76.34%	1973-74	78.65%	1977-78	78.41%
1970-71	76.90%	1974-75	78.30%		

While the 1977-78 salary range average was over one percentage point lower than that of 1972-73, it is significant to note that ranges had been increasing steadily until 1971-72. All ranges since that year have been below 80%.

Combined Survey Responses

It was expected that there might have been significant differences in responses to the survey instrument of this study from representatives of Florida school districts and representatives of FEA United Locals. This expectation was realized in only one area--reporting awareness of the hiring of minimally experienced and/or trained teachers.

Both district and union respondents were almost unanimous in their agreement that experience was rewarded in salary schedules both before and after 1973. A review of salary schedules finds that, with the exception of St. Johns County, all districts did give experience reward before 1973 and continued to do so after 1973. In 1977-78 St. Johns County used experience credit for placement on the schedule only. Over half of both district and union responses reported changes in the level of teacher experience since 1973. Both union and district representatives reported from 45-65% of districts appearing to have had increasing teacher experience since 1973.

Although examination of salary schedules indicated that all Florida districts gave salary reward for training both before and after 1973, responses from districts and unions indicated a decrease in the number of districts giving training credit after 1973. Perhaps the wording or intent of the question was misunderstood. This would account for the discrepancy between the responses and the salary schedule evidence. The intent of the question was to determine if districts gave credit for additional training--not necessarily for a degree or rank change. Perhaps representatives of districts and unions were attempting to reflect the fact that restrictions had been placed on training rewarded since 1973. Both district and union responses indicated that training levels of teachers were on the increase in the state of Florida. Both sources frequently reported increase in inservice and college course offerings as the reasons for higher training levels.

Union and district responses reported an approximate average of 13% of representatives being aware of moves to no longer reward experience and/or training in salary schedules. The one area in which district and union respondents differed significantly in their perceptions was relative to the hiring of minimally experienced and/or trained teachers. It was reported that 57% of the union representatives had knowledge of such hirings, while only 22% of Florida district representatives admitted this knowledge.

CHAPTER VI

FLORIDA SCHOOL DISTRICT FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS SELECTED DISTRICTS

Follow-up personal interviews to initial survey responses of Florida school districts were conducted with representatives of eight selected school districts. It was the purpose of these interviews to solicit information additional to that given in survey responses and to obtain information that could not be easily acquired in a written survey. Specific questions were asked relative to each district's philosophy and directions concerning teacher experience and/or training and their reflection in salary schedules.

Information obtained in these interviews was not reported in previous chapters since the information received was not easily quantifiable. Much of the information reflects philosophy, feelings, and educated guesses as to directions that districts will be taking relative to experience and training. Districts in which interviews were conducted included Brevard, Broward, Clay, Columbia, Dade, Franklin, Hamilton, and Pinellas.

Of the eight districts visited, representatives of four districts indicated a declining student enrollment which required or will require districts to eliminate teachers. Since districts generally eliminate teachers by seniority, this has caused or will cause the number of teachers at the top of the salary ranges to increase. Many teachers are remaining in positions for permanency of position, therefore causing even more persons to be grouped at the top of the salary ranges. Districts are already in economic difficulties due to inflation and the student declines which caused layoffs. Senior teachers remaining of their own choice or as a result of layoff procedures compounds the problem. Some representatives interviewed had initiated planned programs to address these escalating costs, while others indicated a readiness for seeking alternatives. Although respondents of districts indicated that they felt that increased experience and training of teachers are to be valued, officials of districts are showing evidence of recognizing their economic dilemma when these characteristics are rewarded in salary schedules. If a minimally experienced and/or trained teacher could be obtained for less expenditure, district representatives indicated that they would consider hiring this minimally experienced and trained individual--if the individual were otherwise equally prepared. Leaders of four districts were very adamant and vocal in their belief that experience and training should be maintained as salary determinants, however.

Although all districts in which interviews were conducted have maintained experience and training as salary determinants since 1973, the following listing indicates by number of districts the changes or proposed changes in the experience and training dimensions of the salary schedule structure since 1973:

Number of districts	Change implemented or proposed
2	Limit the number of years of experience for which an individual is given credit when hired
1	Refusal to hire persons with advanced degrees due to the added expense
1	Hire teachers with higher verbal test scores to increase student scores
4	Place restrictions on the type of advanced training for which salary credit is given, e.g., Master's infield
5	Alter the number of columns in the salary schedule

The general tenor of the interviews was candid, with representatives quick to report economic difficulties faced. Officials of districts in which interviews were conducted are beginning to look for viable alternatives to their plight which included early retirement plans, retirement seminars and counseling, layoffs by program needs instead of strict seniority, not replacing retirees, and replacing retirees with recent graduates.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The history of teacher employment practices in the United States reveals that as early as colonial times preference in hiring was given to experienced teachers. For years it had been assumed that additional training made a teacher more competent. The belief that teachers with more experience and training made better teachers was built into the salary schedules that developed. The preparational-step type schedule which rewards these characteristics has become the almost universally accepted compensation format.

In 1947 the Minimum Foundation Program was enacted in the state of Florida. This program established a salary floor that was "in accord with accepted principles of recognition for training, experience and ability." The salary portion of the Minimum Foundation Program utilized the preparational-step type salary schedule. It was designed to encourage districts to hire teachers with more experience and training, as funds were allotted to districts by the state, in part, depending upon the level of experience and/or training possessed by their teachers.

In 1973 the state of Florida legislature enacted the Florida Education Finance Program. This program was a modification of the Minimum Foundation Program. It eliminated the MFP salary provisions. Under the Florida Education Finance Program districts were required to adopt a salary schedule or schedules and expend funds for salaries in accordance with the provisions of the schedule, not necessarily rewarding experience or training.

The purpose of this study was to determine if any changes had developed in the state of Florida since the 1973 implementation of the Florida Education Finance Program in employment practices as they relate to experience, training, and compensation patterns--changes that would be permitted, and perhaps encouraged, by elimination of the salary allocation portion of the Minimum Foundation Program.

To make comparisons between the pre and post-1973 eras, data were gathered from existing documents, salary schedules, individual school districts, and Florida Education Association United Locals concerning district experience and training levels and how these teacher characteristics were compensated. A part of the data gathering phase of this study included the distribution of a survey instrument to all Florida school districts (100% return), and to 42 Florida Education Association United Locals (67% return). Follow-up interviews were conducted with representatives of eight selected school districts.

Before the results of the information gathered from these sources are summarized and conclusions presented, it is stressed that changes reported by this study relating to teacher experience, training, and compensation patterns since 1973 in the state of Florida can only infer a crude change and effect relationship. It would be too easy to state that the changes reported are due to the enactment of the Florida Education Finance Program. The fact is that the many economic conditions, the political atmosphere, and other legislative changes occurring at the time the FEFP was enacted are inextricably tied in with the removal of the MFP salary provisions. To say that any one of these variables is responsible for the changes reported would be erroneously simplistic.

The financial difficulties experienced by a great number of school districts in the nation and the state of Florida have caused district officials to look carefully at the entire philosophy of hiring, retaining, and compensating teachers. If district leaders continued to reward experience and training in salary schedule(s), they, no doubt, weighed the increased cost of more experienced and trained teachers against the benefits that they felt these teachers would bring to their district. The lack of guidelines concerning reward for experience and training under FEFP allowed district officials to discontinue the use of experience and training reward for purely economic reasons. It is doubted, however, that such decisions were made without political considerations.

The financial difficulties experienced by school districts could cause one to misinterpret an increase or decrease in teacher experience or training levels. When decline in student population and budget cuts require districts to choose among those already employed, seniority is usually the criterion used (Downey, 1976). Seniority is used because it has the merit of objectivity (Bangs, 1972). When the most senior teachers are the ones retained, this retention will certainly affect the average amount of experience and training possessed by the district's teachers. The resultant increase in experience and training may have little to do with the district philosophy concerning the worth of increased teacher experience and training.

Another variable that occurred concurrently with the enactment of the FEFP must be considered when looking at the changes since 1973. It is the passage of the Collective Bargaining Act for Public Employees. As public employees, teachers were included in the provisions of this Act. Prior to collective bargaining, the MFP had established a statewide salary floor with increments being offered for increased experience and training levels. These might have been desired objectives to be sought through collective bargaining. Under the FEFP legislation, individual Florida districts were permitted to abandon all such salary benefits. The concurrent enactment of the collective bargaining provision most probably curtailed this possibility. It was probably politically unwise to negate the past salary benefits of the MFP the first year of collective bargaining. What seems to have happened was that the salary schedule format used under MFP was incorporated without much question into the newly negotiated salary schedules. As time passes, the various parties may question the MFP format in negotiations, and steps may be taken which move away from or modify the MFP preparational-step schedule.

If one is aware of these intervening economic, political, and legislative factors, the changes that have occurred since the enactment of the FEFP can be placed in appropriate perspective. While the FEFP alone did not cause changes in teacher experience, training, and salary patterns in the state of Florida, the combination of the FEFP's elimination of the salary provisions plus these other factors have brought about the changes summarized below.

Experience Data

Florida districts rewarded experience in salary schedules before 1973 and continued to do so after 1973. Just one district used experience credit for placement on the salary schedule only. Over half of Florida districts have experienced a change in the average experience level since 1973. The profile group of districts which contained the largest and most urban districts had experienced the greatest degree of change in experience levels. The experience level of teachers had decreased an average of approximately one year since 1973. District responses indicated the average level of teacher experience was 9.66 years before 1973. Data solicited from the State Department of Education reported the level of teacher experience as 9.38 years in 1973-74. District representatives reported that the level of experience had decreased to 8.67 years during 1977-78. The most common factors listed as possible reasons for upward or downward trends in teacher experience levels were teacher layoffs and new FEFP programs. Layoffs would account for upward trends, since layoffs are usually in reverse order of seniority. New programs would cause a downward trend as these new programs are frequently staffed by newly graduated teachers.

Training Data

Over 90% of Florida school district and union representatives reported that districts rewarded additional training before and after 1973. Over 55% of both district and union representatives indicated a change in district training levels since 1973.

Training levels have been on the increase in the state of

Florida since 1973. District representatives did not respond in sufficient numbers or in common measures of training to permit an accurate numerical average of years of training to be computed, however. The three profile groups which contained the largest and most urban of Florida's districts reported no districts with declining teacher training since 1973. These statewide increased training levels are contrary to projections that leaders of Florida institutions of higher learning had made for the post-1973 era. It was feared that the FEFP elimination of state reward to districts for training of teachers would reduce college graduate school enrollments significantly. According to district and union responses, this has not happened.

Data were consistant among districts indicating that increases in teacher training in the post-1973 era were due to increased college and inservice courses being made available to teachers. New state university offerings in districts and Teacher Education Centers were frequently mentioned as sources of the increased training.

Miscellaneous Data

Approximately 90% of Florida district and union representatives reported no plans to discontinue rewarding experience and/or training in salary schedules. Twenty-two percent of district respondents did report that minimally experienced and/or trained teachers had been hired over more experienced and/or trained teachers because they were cheaper. It is significant to note that 57% of the Florida Education Association Local leaders surveyed reported awareness of such hirings.

It was anticipated that there might be a relationship between the degree of school based management used in a district and the degree to which minimally experienced and trained teachers were hired. Respondents from districts and unions reported that from 57-58% had school based management. Approximately twelve percent had a degree of school based management. Only one district was found to have school based management to the degree that actual salary costs were charged to the budgets of individual schools, thereby making it financially advantageous to hire less experienced and trained teachers. This district's survey respondent indicated that he was not aware of such hirings, while the FEA United Local representative in this district indicated that he was aware of such hirings. Since there were no other districts reporting the degree of school based management that made it financially advantageous to individual schools hire less experienced and trained teachers, there was no further attempt to determine if school based management and the hiring of minimally experienced and trained teachers are related.

From 94 to 100% of union and district representatives reported that their district had a negotiated salary schedule. This high percentage emphasizes the importance of recognizing and understanding how the FEFP and the Collective Bargaining Act of 1973 jointly influenced educational funding.

Salary Schedule Data

Since the FEFP was enacted, salary schedules for teachers had undergone changes. All districts continued to utilize the preparational-step format which rewarded experience and training, however. Salary ranges from minimum to maximum (a reflection of experience and training credit) had remained below the 80% mark.

Before 1972-73, the ranges had been increasing. The number of districts rewarding training by giving salary credit to persons possessing Rank I and Rank IA had decreased since 1973. Additional districts are considering the elimination of reward for ranks above Rank III. Sixty-three percent of Florida districts have decreased the number of column rewards in their salary schedules to give fewer opportunities for salary increases due to obtaining continuing contract and completion of successful years of teaching. Districts had placed additional restrictions since 1973 on the types of training that qualifies for salary reward.

Conclusions

The concerns that the elimination of the salary portion of the MFP under the FEFP would cause districts to discontinue salary reward for experience and training, thereby causing districts to employ inexperienced and ill-trained teachers has not been substantiated in the data that were gathered and reported in this study. While there were changes reported in experience levels, training levels, and compensation patterns, these changes have not been as rapid and extreme as some anticipated.

Teacher experience and training continued to be rewarded in salary schedules. Only about 10% of Florida district representatives were aware of possible discontinuance of such rewards. There was an increased number of districts which had modified the manner in which experience and training were being rewarded. Survey responses and personal interviews reflected additional intentions to modify present salary schedules. The constraints placed by the Collective

Bargaining Act on rapid elimination of previous gains were being erased with the passage of time. District responses from both surveys and personal interviews seemed to give the impression that as time passes, these past gains will be questioned and used as bargaining chips against dollars desired.

Implications

If Florida trends in teacher experience, training, and compensation patterns reported in this study continue, one would expect:

1. Teaching experience levels to continue to decline, which would be consistent with national trends, unless additional layoffs are necessary. If layoffs are necessary, most teachers would be retained on a seniority basis. This would cause the average level of teacher experience to increase. If layoffs occur while experience and training are rewarded in salary schedules, greater numbers of employees would move to the higher ranges of the salary schedules. If this happens, there will undoubtedly be an increased effort to institute early retirement programs. Two districts in Florida reported having such programs. Early retirement programs are one way to reduce personnel costs without having to resort to wholesale layoffs. Early retirement programs are based on financial rewards that lessen the loss of earnings of early retirees during the first few years of retirement, while enabling the school districts to save considerable sums of money through not

replacing the retiree with a far less costly teacher ("Early Retirement Programs," 1978).

2. Teacher training levels in the state of Florida continue to increase due to increased college and inservice courses, as long as training continues to be rewarded. The movement in individual districts to restrict the kinds of training for which additional reward will be given has great implications for colleges and universities. The State Department of Education will further restrict courses which will be accepted for certificate issuance and extension ("Potential, Performance to be Rated," 1978, p. 1). If certain courses or degrees are not accepted for salary credit or certificate purposes, enrollments in these courses will very likely decline.
3. Alterations in salary schedules due to the fact that the State Department of Education is now planning to eliminate issuance of certificates which include ranks, effective July 1, 1979 ("Potential, Performance to be Rated," 1978, p. 1). Presently, the majority of Florida districts have salary schedules which reward teachers by rank classification.
4. Districts to continue to hire minimally experienced and trained teachers on an informal and unwritten basis. This informal policy is not easily documented. Since the practice takes place before a teacher is hired, it probably is not in violation of a district's contract with teachers. It would be interesting, however, to see the results of litigation in which a prospective teacher had claimed

discrimination in hiring and/or retention due to his/her increased experience and advanced training levels.

5. Districts to investigate and institute the process used by some districts in the past to limit the amount of experience and training that an individual may bring into a district for salary credit. Districts would need to include these previously informal understandings into the negotiated provisions for hiring and reward.
6. Additional districts to implement the school based management model. Many districts are now reporting movement in this direction due to emphasis that is being placed on accountability. When school principals are totally in charge of school budgets, thus having to choose between hiring a teacher with vast experience and training and needed programs and supplies, the relationship between school based management and the hiring of minimally trained and experienced teachers may be determined.
7. Practices started in a district to spread rapidly to other districts. The widespread sharing of negotiation strategies would bring about this phenomenon.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to facilitate future teacher salary studies:

1. In the search for data from local school districts since 1973 concerning teacher experience and training, it was discovered that many district representatives did not know

actual figures concerning teacher experience and training levels. It is recommended that this information be maintained at the local and State Department of Education level. It is difficult for a state official to follow the suggestion of Morphet (1952), that all effects and implications of a state educational finance system be examined carefully, when data for the examination are not even maintained.

2. The results of discontinuing state reward to districts for increased experience and training of teachers were examined in this study to the extent that the author felt possible. One important action that took place simultaneously with the enactment of FEFP was the enactment of the Collective Bargaining Act for Public Employees in Florida. It is this author's contention that these two pieces of legislation are inextricably tied together. It is impossible in the state of Florida to determine how experience and training would have been rewarded under FEFP if the Collective Bargaining Act had not been enacted. It is recommended, therefore, that further study be made of states which institute programs that do not reward increased teacher training or experience--states that do not simultaneously enact collective bargaining legislation.
3. Only one district could be found in the state of Florida which used school based management to the degree that actual salary costs were charged to local schools, thereby making it financially advantageous to principals in the district to

hire minimally experienced and trained teachers. It is recommended that further study be initiated to determine how experience and training levels of teachers are affected when it is financially advantageous for a local school administrator to hire less experienced and/or trained teachers.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, W. I. A critical evaluation of pupil change as a criterion of teacher competency. Special Paper, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1954.

Bangs, J. R. Collective bargaining. New York: Alexander Hamilton Institute, 1972.

Barthelemess, H. M., & Boyer, P. A. A study of the relation between teaching efficiency and amount of college credit earned while in service. Educational Administration and Supervision, 1928, 14, 521-535.

Betts, G. L. Pupil achievement and the NS trait in teachers. In M. Walker (Ed.), The measurement of teaching efficiency. New York: Macmillan Co., 1935.

Boardman, C. W. Professional tests and measures of teaching efficiency in high school. Teachers' College Contributions to Education. New York: Columbia University, 1928, 327, 85.

Bossing, N. L. Teacher aptitude tests and teacher selection. Research in Higher Education, Bulletin No. 12, United States Office of Education, Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1931, pp. 121-132.

Bowles, S. Schooling and inequity. In W. T. Schultz (Ed.), Investment in education. Chicago: Chicago Press, 1971.

Boyce, H. C. Qualities of merit in secondary school teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1912, 3, 144-157.

Burrup, P. E. The teacher and the public school system (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1972.

City schools in crisis. Newsweek, September 12, 1977, 90, 66-71.

Collazo, A., Lewis, A., & Thomas, W. Forcasts of selected social indicators of educational outcomes and recommended policy changes. Florida Department of Education Project on Social Indicators, Contract R 5-175. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, 1976.

Conant, J. B. The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Davis, H. The use of state high school examinations as an instrument for judging the work of teachers. Teachers College Contribution to Education, New York: Columbia University, 1934, 611, 101.

Davis, H. Salary schedules. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1960.

Davis, S. B., & French, L. C. Teacher rating. University of Pittsburgh School of Education Journal, 1928, 3, 57; 60-64.

DeRuzzo, D. School productivity in Kentucky. Financing the Public Schools of Kentucky. Gainesville, Fl.: National Educational Finance Project, 1973, pp. 327-362.

Downey, G. W. What school boards do when that irresistible force called RIF meets that immovable object called affirmative action. The American School Board Journal, October 1976, 163, 35-39.

Dunkin, M., & Biddle B. The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1974.

Early retirement programs. American Association of School Personnel Administrators, Post-Conference Issue, November 1978, p. 1.

Ellena, W. J., & Stinson, W. (Eds.). Who is a good teacher? American Association of School Administrators, Department of Classroom Teachers of the NEA and the National School Boards Association, 1961.

Elsbree, W. S. The American teacher: Evaluation of a profession in a democracy. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1939.

Florida Citizens' Committee on Education. Education and the future of Florida: A study of education in Florida. Tallhassee, Florida: March 1947.

Florida district salary schedules, 1972-73. Part of each district's annual budget submitted to the State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida district salary schedules, 1977-78. State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida district salary schedules: Compilations, 1951-52 through 1977-78. State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

Florida Handbook, 1965-66. Compiled by Allen Morris. Tallahassee, Florida: Peninsular Publishing Company, 1965.

Florida statutes, Chapter 231.24, Extension of Certificates, 1977, p. 59.

Florida statutes, Chapter 231. Contracts with Instructional Staff, 1977, pp. 60-61.

Florida's minimum foundation program...for our children. Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, 1957.

Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education. Improving education in Florida. Tallahassee, Florida: Ford Foundation, 1973.

Grant, W. Trends in the percentage of public school teachers holding a bachelor's degree. American Education, April 1973, 9, 29.

Hall, J. Description of operation of the MFP. Dade County, Florida: Dade County Board of Public Instruction, 1953-54.

Haskew, L. D., & McLendon, C. This is teaching (3rd ed.). Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1968.

Hughes, J. M. Study of intelligence and training of teacher factors conditioning the achievement of pupils. School Review, 1925, 33, 292-302.

Johns, R. L. Incentive grant for quality education. Florida Educational Research and Development Council Monograph. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, 1966.

Kershaw, J. A., & McKean, R. N. Teacher shortages and salary schedules. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Kinney, L. B. Certification in education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Knight, F. B. Qualities related to success in teaching. Teachers' contributions to education. New York: Columbia University, 1928.

Levin, H. M. A cost effective analysis and teacher selection. In D. Gerwin (Ed.), The employment of teachers: Some analytical views. Berkeley, California: McCuthan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Main, Jeremy. Careers for the 1980's: 10 of the best-and 10 of the worst. Money. November 1977, 6, 62-69.

Morganthau, Tom. Legislature plans revamp of public school system. The Miami Herald. April 2, 1973, pp. 1B; 6B.

Morphet, E. L. Characteristics of state support programs. In R. L. Johns & E. L. Morphet (Eds.), Problems and issues in public school finance. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1952.

Morsch, J., & Wilder, E. Identifying the effective instructor: A review of quantative studies, 1900-52. In J. B. Farrell (Ed.), Research for teachers. Sidney, Australia: Angus & Robertson Publishers, PTY LTD., 1971.

Moss, F. A., Lowan, W. M. & Hunt, T. Impersonal measurement of teaching. Educational Record, 1929, 10, 40-50.

NEA Research Division. New profile of the American public school teacher. Today's Education, May 1972, 5, 14-17.

NEA survey: No teacher surplus. The Miami Herald, July 3, 1977, p. 32A.

Potential, performance to be rated. Florida Schools, October 1978, 26, 1.

Profiles of Florida school districts, 1976-77. Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education.

Riehle, H. A study of classroom teachers' salaries for 1951-52. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, 1952.

Ritter, E. L. Rating of teachers in Indiana. Elementary School Journal, 1918, 18, 740-756.

Rolfe, J. F. The measurement of teaching ability, Study No. 2. Journal of Experimental Education, 1954, 14, 52-74.

Status of the American public school teacher, 1975-76. Washington, D. C.: Education Association Research Division, 1977.

Stinnett, L. M., Drummond, W. H., & Garry, A. W. Introduction to teaching. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1976.

Tiedeman, D. V. (Ed.). Teacher competence and its relation to salary. Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, July 1952.

Turner, R. L., & Fatter, N. A. Problem solving proficiency among elementary teachers: The development of criticism. Monograph of the Institute of Educational Research. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, May 1960.

Young, F. Efficiency of high school teachers as measured by principal's ratings. Texas Outlook, January 1937, 21, 24-25.

Waller, W. The sociology of teaching. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Walter, R. L. The teacher and collective bargaining. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1975.

APPENDIX A

FLORIDA DISTRICT PROFILE GROUPINGS

DISTRICT GROUPINGS

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Alachua	Bay	Columbia	Baker	Calhoun
Brevard	Charlotte	Highlands	Bradford	Dixie
Broward	Clay	Lake	Citrus	Gasden
Dade	Collier	Marion	DeSoto	Gilchrist
Duval	Escambia	Martin	Flagler	Glades
Hillsborough	Indian River	Osceola	Franklin	Hamilton
Leon	Lee	Pasco	Gulf	Hardee
Orange	Manatee	St. Johns	Hendry	Holmes
Palm Beach	Monroe	St. Lucie	Hernando	Jefferson
Pinellas	Okaloosa	Santa Rosa	Jackson	Lafayette
Sarasota	Polk		Nassau	Levy
	Seminole		Okeechobee	Liberty
	Volusia		Putnam	Madison
			Suwannee	Sumter
			Taylor	Union
			Walton	Wakulla
			Washington	

APPENDIX B

COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 1951-52

TABLE B

COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION--1951-52

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Alachua	$2,400-$3,700	54%	10	I II III IV	
Baker	$2,325-$3,825	64%	ND*	I II III	
Bay	$2,395-$3,940	64%	10	I II III IV V	
Bradford	$2,400-$4,050	69%	10	I II III IV V VI	Increments each year to maximum. Increments vary from year to year in some districts.
Brevard	$2,400-$4,200	75%	15	I II III IV V	
Broward	$2,800-$4,400	57%	ND	I II III IV V	
Calhoun	$2,350-$3,150	34%	7	- II III IV V VI	
Charlotte	$2,200-$4,420	101%	ND	I II III	
Citrus	$2,440-$4,000	64%	10	I II III IV V VI	
Clay	$2,480-$3,940	59%	16	I II III IV V	
Collier	$2,250-$3,270	45%	12	- II III IV V VI	
Columbia	$2,304-$3,920	70%	10	I II III IV V VI	

*No data available

TABLE B

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Dade	$2,400-$4,800	100%	13	I II III	
DeSoto	$2,328-$3,193	37%	12	- II III IV	
Dixie	$2,350-$3,600	53%	ND	I II III	
Duval	$2,400-$4,636	93%	17	I II III IV V	Increments each year to maximum. Increments vary from year to year in some districts.
Escambia	$2,250-$3,800	69%	10	I II III IV V VI	
Flagler	$2,600-$3,800	46%	ND	I II III	
Franklin	$2,300-$3,400	48%	3	I II III	
Gadsden	$2,280-$3,600	58%	7	I II III IV V	
Gilchrist	$2,250-$3,250	44%	ND	- II III	
Glades	$2,400-$4,200	75%	ND	I II III IV	
Gulf	$2,250-$3,975	77%	10	I II III IV V	

TABLE B

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Hamilton	$2,250-$3,800	69%	10	I II III	
Hardee	$2,250-$3,150	40%	8	- II III IV V	
Hendry	$2,350-$4,000	70%	12	I II III IV V	Increments each year to maximun. Increments vary from year to year in some districts.
Hernando	$2,368-$3,500	48%	8	- II III IV V	
Highlands	$2,600-$3,300	27%	10	I II III IV V	
Hillsborough	$2,500-$4,300	72%	11	I II III IV V	
Holmes	$2,300-$3,200	39%	5	- II III IV V	
Indian River	$2,375-$3,275	38%	6	- II III IV V	
Jackson	$2,244-$3,660	63%	10	I II III IV V	
Jefferson	$2,550-$3,800	49%	7	I II III IV V	
Lafayette	$2,400-$3,280	37%	10	- II III IV V VI	

TABLE B

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Lake	$1,550-$3,975	156%	12	I II III IV V (Merit included)	
Lee	$2,125-$4,050	91%	13	I II III	
Leon	$2,134-$3,365	58%	25	I II III IV V VI	Increments each year to maximum.
Levy	$2,500-$4,000	60%	12	I II III	
Liberty	$2,550-$4,200	65%	10	I II III IV V VI	Increments vary from year to year in some districts.
Madison	$2,340-$3,840	64%	ND	I II III	
Manatee	$2,200-$3,700	68%	18	I II III IV V VI	
Marion	$2,300-$4,000	74%	6	I II III IV V	
Martin	$2,310-$3,400	47%	ND	- II III	
Monroe	$2,700-$4,300	59%	12	I II III IV V VI	
Nassau	$2,500-$4,000	60%	10	I II III IV	

TABLE B

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Okaloosa	$2,340-$3,480	49%	6	I II III IV V	
Okeechobee	$2,250-$3,840	71%	14	I II III IV V VI	
Orange	$2,250-$4,200	87%	ND	I II III	Increments each year to maximum.
Osceola	$2,580-$3,750	45%	ND	I II III	
Palm Beach	$2,000-$4,825	141%	15	I II III	Increments vary from year to year in some districts.
Pasco	$2,400-$4,050	69%	16	I II III IV	
Pinellas	$2,700-$4,500	67%	15	I II III	
Polk	$2,304-$3,960	72%	12	I II III IV V	
Putnam	$2,200-$3,800	73%	12	I II III	
St. Johns	$2,200-$3,900	77%	ND	I II III	
St. Lucie	$2,280-$3,600	58%	ND	I II III	

TABLE B

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Santa Rosa	$2,210-$3,650	65%	11	I II III IV V	
Sarasota	$2,200-$3,800	73%	10	I II III IV	
Seminole	$2,400-$4,000	67%	12	I II III IV V VI	
Sumter	$2,400-$3,900	62%	10	I II III	Increments each year to maximum.
Suwanee	$2,172-$3,960	82%	ND	I II III	Increments vary from year to year in some districts.
Taylor	$2,300-$3,300	43%	10	- II III IV V	
Union	$2,850-$4,000	40%	5	I II III IV V VI	
Volusia	$2,560-$4,250	66%	15	- II III IV V	
Wakulla	$2,300-$3,900	70%	ND	I II III	
Walton	$2,350-$3,600	53%	ND	ND	
Washington	$2,472-$3,872	57%	10	I II III IV V	

APPENDIX C

COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 1972-1973

TABLE C

COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION--1972-1973

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Alachua	$6,900-$12,040	74%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Baker	$7,300-$11,800	62%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Bay	$6,868-$11,926	74%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Bradford	$7,035-$12,600	79%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Brevard	$6,567-$12,740	94%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-6 CC-10
Broward	$7,300-$15,050	106%	45	I IA II III	AC CC Incentive
Calhoun	$6,400-$11,150	74%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Charlotte	$6,825-$12,680	86%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-6
Citrus	$6,750-$11,723	74%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-10 CC-15
Clay	$6,700-$11,900	78%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Collier	$7,050-$14,700	108%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

TABLE C

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Columbia	$7,000-$12,600	80%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Dade	$7,401-$14,609	97%	16	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7
DeSoto	$6,000-$10,094	68%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-6
Dixie	$6,600-$10,296	56%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-15
Duval	$6,950-$12,520	80%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Escambia	$6,500-$12,495	92%	15	I IA II III	AC CC
Flagler	$6,600-$12,400	88%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Franklin	$6,700-$10,650	59%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC-10
Gadsden	$7,000-$11,800	68%	20	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15 CC-20
Gilchrist	$7,000-$12,336	76%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

TABLE C

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Glades	$6,858-$12,540	83%	17	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Gulf	$6,615-$11,135	68%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC
Hamilton	$6,600-$12,438	88%	15	I IA II III IV V	ND
Hardee	$6,700-$12,900	92%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Hendry	$6,900-$12,625	83%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10
Hernando	$6,400-$11,904	86%	20	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Highlands	$7,000-$12,725	82%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Hillsborough	$5,701-$11,850	108%	16	I IA II III	ND
Holmes	$6,800-$11,050	62%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Indian River	$6,800-$12,375	82%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

TABLE C

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Jackson	$6,900-$11,100	61%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC
Jefferson	$6,500-$11,313	74%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Lafayette	$6,700-$11,200	67%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Lake	$6,780-$12,880	90%	15	I -- II III IV	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Lee	$6,800-$12,500	84%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Leon	$6,300-$11,214	78%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Levy	$7,000-$12,590	80%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Liberty	$6,950-$11,750	69%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Madison	$6,670-$11,105	66%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

TABLE C

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Manatee	$6,750-$13,950	107%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Marion	$6,400-$11,400	78%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Martin	$6,825-$11,220	64%	15	- -- II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Monroe	$7,300-$13,700	88%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Nassau	$6,800-$11,760	73%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Okaloosa	$6,600-$13,263	101%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC
Okeechobee	$7,200-$11,112	54%	15	- IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Orange	$7,000-$13,230	89%	15	I IA II III	AC CC-3 CC-10
Osceola	$6,900-$13,262	92%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

TABLE C

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Palm Beach	$7,100-$14,200	100%	15	I IA II III IV	AC CC
Pasco	$6,750-$11,950	77%	16	I IA II III	AC CC
Pinellas	$7,100-$12,500	76%	15	I IA II III	ND
Polk	$7,000-$13,400	91%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Putnam	$6,450-$12,337	91%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
St. Johns	$6,600-$12,000	82%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
St. Lucie	$6,500-$12,175	87%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Santa Rosa	$6,800-$12,342	81%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Sarasota	$6,300-$12,222	94%	15	I IA II III	ND

TABLE C

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Seminole	$6,600-$12,342	87%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-10
Sumter	$6,750-$12,450	84%	16	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Suwanee	$6,900-$12,700	84%	20	- IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Taylor	$7,140-$12,847	80%	16	I IA II III	ND
Union	$6,800-$11,200	65%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Volusia	$6,720-$11,962	78%	15	I IA II III	Index
Wakulla	$6,500-$10,010	54%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Walton	$6,700-$11,763	75%	16	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Washington	$6,750-$11,340	68%	15	I IA II III IV V	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

APPENDIX D

SURVEY FORM

A Comparison of Florida Teacher Experience, Training, and Compensation Patterns Occurring Before and After the Enactment of the Florida Education Finance Program

1. Did/does your local salary schedule give teachers monetary reward for increased experience? (Please check the appropriate response(s).

Before 1973 under MFP	After 1973 under FEFP
yes_____ no_____	yes_____ no_____

2. Did/does your local salary schedule give teachers monetary reward for increased training? (Inservice or college credit)

Before 1973 under MFP	After 1973 under FEFP
yes_____ no_____	yes_____ no_____

3. Has your district experienced a change in the average number of years of teacher experience since 1973?

yes____ no____

4. Which of the following best describes the average number of years of experience of teachers in your district? You will probably need to mark more than one.

Average No. of Years of Experience
Actual or Approximation

_____Average number of years increasing before 1973
_____Average number of years decreasing before 1973] ___ ___
_____Average number of years increasing after 1973
_____Average number of years decreasing after 1973] ___ ___
_____Average number of years has remained constant ___ ___

5. Has your district experienced any factors that could cause an upward or downward trend in the average numbers of years of experience of teachers in your district since 1973? (Example, hiring freezes, layoffs of first-year teachers, etc.)

Please explain ____
____
____

6. Has your district experienced a change in the average level of teacher training since 1973?

yes____ no ____

7. Which of the following best describes the amount of teacher training possessed by teachers in your district? You will probably need to mark more then one.

Average No. of Years of Training
Actual or Approximation

_____Average number of years increasing before 1973
_____Average number of years decreasing before 1973] ____ ____
_____Average number of years increasing after 1973
_____Average number of years decreasing after 1973] ____ ____
_____Average number of years has remained constant? ____ ____

8. Has your district experienced any factors that could account for an upward or downward trend in the average level of teacher training since 1973? (Example, new State University, Teacher Center, etc.)

yes____ no____

Please explain____
____
____

9. Have there been or are there any moves in your district toward no longer giving monetary reward to teachers for:

a. increased years of experience? yes____ no____
b. additional training? yes____ no____

Please explain____
____
____

10. Are you aware of any instances in your district in which persons hired for positions were considered because they had minimal experience and training levels which made them less expensive to hire?

yes____ no____

11. Does your school district use school based management?

yes____ no____

12. Do you wish to receive the results of this survey?

yes____ no____

13. Comments: Feel free to use the back of this form if you need additional space.

14. Is your district salary schedule negotiated?

yes____ no____

Name of person responding____________________

(optional)

School District____________________

APPENDIX E

COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION 1977-1978

TABLE E

COMPILATION OF FLORIDA DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY INFORMATION--1977-78

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Alachua	$8,800-$16,700	90%	17	I IA II III	AC CC
Baker	$9,220-$15,300	66%	18	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Bay	$8,900-$16,505	85%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Bradford	$8,700-$15,300	76%	16	I IA II III	AC CC 4-16
Brevard	$9,000-$16,020	78%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-6 CC-10
Broward	$9,500-$20,450	115%	25	I IA II III	Base Equivalency at 1 year Incentive at 3 years
Calhoun	$8,800-$14,400	64%	20	I IA II III	Increment each year
Charlotte	$8,560-$16,075	88%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-6
Citrus	$8,375-$14,908	78%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Clay	$8,820-$15,430	75%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Collier	$9,500-$18,700	97%	15	I IA II III	None listed Increment each year
Columbia	$8,600-$16,010	86%	16	I IA II III	AC CC

TABLE E

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Dade	$9,989-$19,789	98%	13	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7
DeSoto	$8,100-$11,700	44%	16	- -- II III	AC CC
Dixie	$8,400-$13,480	60%	16	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Duval	$8,900-$16,797	89%	16	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10
Escambia	$8,600-$16,348	90%	17	I IA II III	None listed Increment each year
Flagler	$8,400-$13,600	62%	15	- IA II III	None listed Increment each year
Franklin	$7,900-$12,975	64%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Gadsden	$8,347-$14,212	70%	15	I IA II III	None listed Increment each year
Gilchrist	$8,800-$14,248	62%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Glades	$8,540-$14,443	69%	15	- -- II III	AC CC
Gulf	$8,407-$15,104	80%	16	I IA II III	AC CC

TABLE E

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Hamilton	$8,400-$13,400	59%	20	- -- II III	None listed Increments annually
Hardee	$8,600-$15,792	84%	18	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Hendry	$9,000-$15,930	77%	20	I IA II III	BA+24 BA+18
Hernando	$8,800-$14,889	69%	16	I IA II III	AC CC
Highlands	$8,800-$16,600	89%	13	I IA II III	AC CC
Hillsborough	$9,000-$16,301	81%	17	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Holmes	$8,400-$14,432	72%	15	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Indian River	$8,600-$15,475	80%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Jackson	$8,600-$15,300	78%	16	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Jefferson	$7,903-$13,336	69%	16	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Lafayette	$8,200-$13,950	70%	20	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually

TABLE E

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Lake	$8,500-$14,650	72%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Lee	$9,100-$16,100	77%	20	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Leon	$7,850-$15,020	91%	16	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Levy	$8,955-$15,590	74%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Liberty	$8,100-$14,415	78%	17	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Madison	$8,155-$13,746	68%	16	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Manatee	$9,128-$17,951	97%	20	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Marion	$8,520-$14,520	70%	17	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Martin	$8,800-$16,069	83%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Monroe	$9,300-$16,411	76%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Nassau	$8,425-$13,875	65%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

TABLE E

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Okaloosa	$8,300-$16,630	100%	15	I IA II III	AC CC
Okeechobee	$8,620-$14,635	70%	16	- IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Orange	$8,850-$16,514	86%	15	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Osceola	$8,250-$15,263	85%	15	I -- II III	None listed Increments annually
Palm Beach	$9,200-$19,405	111%	16	I IA II III	AC CC CC-10
Pasco	$8,900-$14,755	66%	17	I IA II III	AC CC
Pinellas	$9,000-$17,200	91%	15	I IA II III	BA+15
Polk	$8,800-$16,315	85%	15	I IA II III	AC CC
Putnam	$8,410-$15,583	85%	21	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
St. Johns	$9,650-$14,650	52%	15 Entry only	- -- II III	Raises as negotiated to individual salary
St. Lucie	$8,900-$15,050	69%	15	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually

TABLE E

(continued)

	Range Rank III to highest Rank	Percentage increase from minimum to maximum	Experience rewarded in years	Ranks rewarded listed on schedule	Columns rewarded
Santa Rosa	$8,453-$16,932	100%	18	I IA II III	AC CC
Sarasota	$9,092-$17,638	94%	15	I IA II III	BA+15 BA+30 MA+30 MA+45
Seminole	$8,700-$16,600	91%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-10
Sumter	$8,800-$16,552	88%	17	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15
Suwannee	$8,500-$15,220	79%	20	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually to 15
Taylor	$8,505-$15,394	81%	16	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Union	$8,400-$14,175	69%	19	I IA II III	BA+18 BA+27
Volusia	$8,925-$15,887	78%	15	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Wakulla	$8,200-$14,200	73%	18	I IA II III	AC CC
Walton	$8,350-$14,500	74%	20	I IA II III	None listed Increments annually
Washington	$8,862-$14,375	62%	15	I IA II III	AC CC CC-7 CC-10 CC-15

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Martha Jean Belcher was born in Miami, Florida, on April 22, 1940. She is the only child of Robert Emmitt Belcher (deceased) and Clara L. Belcher.

After graduating from Miami Jackson Senior High School in 1958, Miss Belcher received her bachelor's degree from the University of Miami in 1962, her Master of Science degree in educational administration and supervision from Florida International University in 1974, and her Specialist degree in administration and supervision of education from the University of Florida in 1976. She is currently fulfilling the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree with a major in educational administration and minors in curriculum and educational foundations.

Miss Belcher has held various positions with the Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida. Miss Belcher began her educational career as an art teacher on the junior high level. She then accepted a position as a Human Relations Specialist in a Federal Project designed to give student and staff support in resolving problems occasioned by desegregation.

While working toward the Doctor of Education degree, Miss Belcher has been employed as an Assistant School Administrator in an alternative school, Administrative Assistant to the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, Dade County Public Schools, and Assistant Principal of Arvida Junior High School.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

S. Kern Alexander

S. Kern Alexander, Chairman
Professor of Educational Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Ralph B Kimbrough

Ralph B. Kimbrough
Professor of Educational Administration

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Arthur J. Lewis

Arthur J. Lewis
Professor of Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Educational Administration in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

June 1979

Dean, Graduate School